



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 2016

No. 67

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 2, 2016, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 2016

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of a world where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and where honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

As Members take time in the coming week for constituency visits, give them the ability to hear the voices of all in their districts so that when they return, they are focused on the important work to be done.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TROTT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENTS OF MARTIN AND CATHERINE TERBRACK

(Mr. TROTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary achievements of Martin and Catherine Terbrack of Troy, Michigan. Mr. and Mrs. Terbrack were recently recognized by CARE House of Oakland County as Foster Parents of the Year.

CARE House is a wonderful organization in southeast Michigan that provides services and counseling to children who are victims of abuse.

The Terbracks have cared for 33 children, newborn babies to 5-year-old kids, and are currently caring for a 14-month-old baby girl who was 6 weeks old and weighed only 4 pounds when they brought her into their home.

The Terbrack family has been involved in fostering for an amazing 73 years, with Martin's mother, Peggy,

having cared for 150 children. That equates to about 90,000 bottles and 220,000 diapers.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when many have come to see our Nation defined by acrimony and division, the wonderful story of Martin and Catherine Terbrack of Troy, Michigan, reminds us all that there is more good in this world than bad.

They have taught us that many of our problems we face can be solved with love and generosity, and they remind us that we all have the power to touch people's lives for the better.

Martin and Catherine do that every day.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4651

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 4651.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

BLACK APRIL AND FALL OF SAIGON

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, April 30, marks 41 years since the fall of Saigon, commemorated as Black April in Vietnamese American communities across this Nation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2113

I introduced a resolution in remembrance of this event, and to honor the contributions and the sacrifices of Vietnamese Americans.

In addition, this week, in front of my congressional office, I am flying the Vietnamese Heritage and Freedom Flag, as recognized by States and localities across this country.

As we remember the fall of Saigon, I also believe it is critically important to continue to shine a light on human rights abuses in Vietnam.

When President Obama visits Vietnam next week, I hope he will make human rights a priority. Now is exactly the right time for Vietnam to begin respecting the rights of its own citizens.

AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because April is Autism Awareness Month.

Autism is a condition that affects more than 3 million Americans and their families. Those living with autism spectrum disorders face challenges on a daily basis.

Though we have come a long way, much more must be done to ensure a high quality of life for all. Some of this work needs to happen right here in the United States Congress, but much of this work also needs to happen in our homes and in our communities.

That is why, together with my Disability Awareness Advisory Board, I have been fighting for greater acceptance and understanding, working to ensure that those with autism have greater access to education and employment and have the place they deserve within our community.

One of the great organizations in Illinois' 10th Congressional District is Lambs Farm. Those with developmental disabilities served by Lambs Farm are provided the opportunity to advance in all areas of life through ever-increasing residential, vocational, and recreational choices.

Together, we are striving for a society where those living with autism and other disabilities are free to pursue their passions, receive a high-quality education, and have their unique gifts celebrated.

BOOSTING AMERICA'S EXPORTS ACT

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, for corporations with a boardroom full of lawyers and thousands of employees, exporting products is something they do every day.

But for a small-business owner or startup entrepreneurs in places like Rockford, Galesburg, Peoria, or the

Quad Cities, the deck is stacked against them on the global economic playing field.

That is why today I introduced the Boosting America's Export Act. It will help small- and medium-sized businesses expand economic opportunity and create more good-paying American jobs.

My bill will identify and assist small businesses that have the potential to sell the products in new markets.

We already know that small businesses create two out of every three jobs and, by building a business climate that helps them grow and succeed, we will strengthen working families across our Nation.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with me in this effort.

INVESTMENT SPURRED BY SOUND FIDUCIARY RULES

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.J. Res. 88, a measure to reject the Department of Labor's misguided fiduciary rule.

Just like ObamaCare gets between you and your doctor, this conflict-of-interest rule attempts to put Washington between you and your financial adviser, insisting on a broad, onerous piece of regulation rather than a simple solution based on best business practices that attracts plaintiff attorneys and a bonanza of new lawsuits.

Even State officials in New York, which is a Democratic stronghold, have proposed simpler solutions that inform consumers without burdening investment businesses, if only the Department of Labor would listen.

I implore the Senate to pass this measure and the President to listen to State officials, actual financial investors, and small investors, who have developed a better alternative, by signing this legislation into law and not stymieing investment for families and our economy.

LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, an American is killed with a gun every 16 minutes. And what is Congress' response?

Well, here is what we have become really good at. We have become really good at coming together for moments of silence. We do it every time there is a mass shooting. And, in 2015, there were 330 mass shootings.

We ask: Why can't we do more?

And our response, the response too often, is: We don't need to do anything else. There are plenty of laws on the books.

Why don't we enforce them? Well, the fact is that there is one thing we can do that is not on the books. We can require that everyone who buys a gun has a background check.

If you buy a gun in a store, you have to get a background check. But for gun shows, 100 gun shows a week, 5,200 gun shows a year, 5 million people traveling through those gun shows, there is no background check.

There is no background check for the millions of Internet ads or classified ads.

Let's pass mandatory background checks to help keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people. That is what we can do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is too much at stake for us to continue to ignore this tragedy. It is time for Congress to act.

RURAL HEALTH ACT OF 2016

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last fall a hospital in my State closed its doors after years of being the only hospital within a 100-mile radius. Unlike in more populated communities, when a rural hospital closes, residents can be left with the frightening reality that emergency medical care and medical care services may be too far away.

Sadly, this is not the only isolated incident. More than 30 percent of America's rural hospitals are vulnerable to the conditions that may have caused the closure of 71 facilities in the last 6 years. The numbers increase each year, and we have to act now to prevent more families from losing their lifelines in times of emergency.

That is why I am introducing the bipartisan Rural Health Act of 2016. It will support existing rural hospitals by strengthening resources for State Offices of Rural Health and incentivize construction of new facilities for those communities in need.

Our rural communities need our attention. We cannot let them down.

HEROIN AND OPIOID ADDICTION

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of those we have lost to heroin and opioid addiction.

Another 30 people are likely to die today, another 30 lives lost on top of the thousands that we are losing each year to this epidemic. We have lost daughters and sons, fathers and mothers, sisters, brothers. Friends, acquaintances, and coworkers alike have lost their battles with addiction.

Too often their deaths have been cloaked in the shadows. Obituaries remain silent on the cause of death. For too long our society has viewed opioid

addiction as simply a moral failing rather than the treatable medical condition that it is.

While opioid addiction may start with an excessive prescription or an indiscretion of youth, it ends with a scientifically understood, increasingly treatable, medical condition in which the biochemical pathways necessary to normal decisionmaking in the brain have been hijacked and the chemistry of the brain permanently altered.

Heroin does not discriminate. It does not care if you are rich or poor, Black or White, a devoted mother, or a loving child. None of us are immune to its chemical grips.

So today I pay my respects. Those who fall prey to opioids are worthy of being mourned. They are not forgotten.

WE NEED TO INVESTIGATE COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the National Association of Community Health Centers stated:

Federally-Qualified Health Centers do not provide abortions to any of their patients, and we are not aware of any that have ever done so.

Remember last year we said we wanted to give community health centers more money because they assured us that they didn't do abortions?

However, on Tuesday, April 26, this week, we learned that some health center clinics in New York have been performing abortions.

The National Association of Community Health Centers has egregiously violated our trust. The fact that abortions are performed at these federally funded community health center clinics is astonishing.

We put our confidence in them, as providers of life-affirming women's health care, based on their commitment to not entangle such care with abortion. Abortion is not health care.

Mr. Speaker, we need an investigation into Community Health Centers to determine how many of their clinics are providing for, referring, or performing abortions, and the National Association of Community Health Centers should expel this network of New York clinics from their association.

□ 0915

NATIONAL REENTRY WEEK

(Ms. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Reentry Week—reentry after an individual has paid their debt to society. Eighty-five percent of individuals who are incarcerated eventually get out, and we need to make sure that they have access to a well-paying job and quality education when they return home.

Reentry programs work. Mr. Jerrel McCoy lives in south L.A. He is 45 years old and served 27 years in a California prison. Today Mr. McCoy works for SHIELDS for Families-Jericho Vocational Services, which works with formerly incarcerated individuals to help them secure and maintain employment to avoid going back to prison.

With the help of these reentry services, Mr. McCoy has purchased his first car and moved into an apartment. According to Mr. McCoy, reentry programs allowed him to apply skills developed during his incarceration, and he learned that he has gifts and potential. Today Mr. McCoy strives to offer these benefits to his clients.

Reentry services are smart and just.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 706, I call up the bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 706, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4901

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act” or the “SOAR Reauthorization Act”.

(b) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10; sec. 38–1853.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code).

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

Section 817 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114–113) is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such section is restored or revived as if such section had not been enacted into law.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

Section 3003 (sec. 38–1853.03, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “particularly parents” and all that follows through “with” and inserting “particularly parents of students who attend an elementary school or secondary school identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia’s accountability system, with”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITING IMPOSITION OF LIMITS ON TYPES OF ELIGIBLE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM.

Section 3004(a) (sec. 38–1853.04(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) PROHIBITING IMPOSITION OF LIMITS ON ELIGIBLE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program under this division, the Secretary may

not limit the number of eligible students receiving scholarships under section 3007(a), and may not prevent otherwise eligible students from participating in the program under this division, based on any of the following:

“(i) The type of school the student previously attended.

“(ii) Whether or not the student previously received a scholarship or participated in the program, including whether an eligible student was awarded a scholarship in any previous year but has not used the scholarship, regardless of the number of years of nonuse.

“(iii) Whether or not the student was a member of the control group used by the Institute of Education Sciences to carry out previous evaluations of the program under section 3009.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to waive the requirement under section 3005(b)(1)(B) that the eligible entity carrying out the program under this Act must carry out a random selection process, which gives weight to the priorities described in section 3006, if more eligible students seek admission in the program than the program can accommodate.”.

SEC. 5. REQUIRING ELIGIBLE ENTITIES TO UTILIZE INTERNAL FISCAL AND QUALITY CONTROLS.

Section 3005(b)(1) (sec. 38–1853.05(b)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking “, except that a participating school may not be required to submit to more than 1 site visit per school year”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (K) and (L) as subparagraphs (L) and (M), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

“(K) how the entity will ensure the financial viability of participating schools in which 85 percent or more of the total number of students enrolled at the school are participating eligible students that receive and use an opportunity scholarship;”;

(4) in subparagraph (L), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(N) how the eligible entity will ensure that it—

“(i) utilizes internal fiscal and quality controls; and

“(ii) complies with applicable financial reporting requirements and the requirements of this division; and”.

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF PRIORITIES FOR AWARDING SCHOLARSHIPS TO ELIGIBLE STUDENTS.

Section 3006(1) (sec. 38–1853.06(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “attended” and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting “attended an elementary school or secondary school identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia’s accountability system; and”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (B);

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(4) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (3), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “or whether such students have, in the past, attended a private school;”.

SEC. 7. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.

(a) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS; COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 3007(a)(4) (sec. 38–1853.07(a)(4), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

“(F) ensures that, with respect to core subject matter, participating students are taught by a teacher who has a baccalaureate degree or equivalent degree, whether such degree was awarded in or outside of the United States;” and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) conducts criminal background checks on school employees who have direct and unsupervised interaction with students; and

“(H) complies with all requests for data and information regarding the reporting requirements described in section 3010.”

(b) ACCREDITATION.—Section 3007(a) (sec. 38-1853.07(a), D.C. Official Code), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (2), (3), and (5)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds provided under this division for opportunity scholarships may be used by a participating eligible student to enroll in a participating private school unless the school—

“(i) in the case of a school that is a participating school as of the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act—

“(I) is fully accredited by an accrediting body described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 2202(16) of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-134; sec. 38-1802.02(16)(A)–(G), D.C. Official Code); or

“(II) if such participating school does not meet the requirements of subclause (I)—

“(aa) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113), the school is pursuing full accreditation in accordance with an accrediting body described in subclause (I); and

“(bb) is fully accredited by such an accrediting body not later than 5 years after the date on which that school began the process of pursuing full accreditation in accordance with item (aa); and

“(ii) in the case of a school that is not a participating school as of the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, is fully accredited by an accrediting body described in clause (i)(I) before becoming a participating school under this division.

“(B) REPORTS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, each participating school shall submit to the eligible entity a certification that the school has been fully accredited in accordance with subparagraph (A).

“(C) ASSISTING STUDENTS IN ENROLLING IN OTHER SCHOOLS.—If a participating school fails to meet the requirements of this paragraph, the eligible entity shall assist the parents of the participating eligible students who attend the school in identifying, applying to, and enrolling in another participating school under this division.

“(6) TREATMENT OF STUDENTS AWARDED A SCHOLARSHIP IN A PREVIOUS YEAR.—An eligible entity shall treat a participating eligible student who was awarded an opportunity scholarship in any previous year and who has not used the scholarship as a renewal student and not as a new applicant, without regard as to—

“(A) whether the eligible student has used the scholarship; and

“(B) the year in which the scholarship was previously awarded.”

(c) REQUIRING USE OF FUNDS REMAINING UNOBLIGATED FROM PREVIOUS FISCAL YEARS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3007 (sec. 38-1853.07, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) REQUIRING USE OF FUNDS REMAINING UNOBLIGATED FROM PREVIOUS FISCAL YEARS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that any funds appropriated for the opportunity scholarship program under this division for any fiscal year remain available for subsequent fiscal years under section 3014(c), the Secretary shall make such funds available to eligible entities receiving grants under section 3004(a) for the uses described in paragraph (2)—

“(A) in the case of any remaining funds that were appropriated before the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, beginning on the date of enactment of such Act; and

“(B) in the case of any remaining funds appropriated on or after the date of enactment of such Act, by the first day of the first subsequent fiscal year.

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—If an eligible entity to which the Secretary provided additional funds under paragraph (1) elects to use such funds during a fiscal year, the eligible entity shall use—

“(A) not less than 95 percent of such additional funds to provide additional scholarships for eligible students under section 3007(a), or to increase the amount of the scholarships, during such year; and

“(B) not more than a total of 5 percent of such additional funds for administrative expenses, parental assistance, or tutoring, as described in subsections (b) and (c), during such year.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE.—Any amounts made available for administrative expenses, parental assistance, or tutoring under paragraph (2)(B) shall be in addition to any other amounts made available for such purposes in accordance with subsections (b) and (c).”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3007 (sec. 38-1853.07, D.C. Official Code), as amended by this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

“(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall make \$2,000,000 of the amount made available under section 3014(a)(1) for each fiscal year available to eligible entities receiving a grant under section 3004(a) to cover the following expenses:

“(1) The administrative expenses of carrying out its program under this division during the year, including—

“(A) determining the eligibility of students to participate;

“(B) selecting the eligible students to receive scholarships;

“(C) determining the amount of the scholarships and issuing the scholarships to eligible students;

“(D) compiling and maintaining financial and programmatic records;

“(E) conducting site visits as described in section 3005(b)(1)(I); and

“(F)(i) conducting a study, including a survey of participating parents, on any barriers for participating eligible students in gaining admission to, or attending, the participating school that is their first choice; and

“(ii) not later than the end of the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, submitting a report to Congress that contains the results of such study.

“(2) The expenses of educating parents about the eligible entity’s program under

this division, and assisting parents through the application process under this division, including—

“(A) providing information about the program and the participating schools to parents of eligible students, including information on supplemental financial aid that may be available at participating schools;

“(B) providing funds to assist parents of students in meeting expenses that might otherwise preclude the participation of eligible students in the program; and

“(C) streamlining the application process for parents.”; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d), and subsection (e) (as added by subsection (c)(1)), as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(e) CLARIFICATION OF USE OF FUNDS FOR STUDENT ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE.—Section 3007(c) (sec. 38-1853.07(c), D.C. Official Code), as redesignated by subsection (d)(2), is amended by striking “previously attended” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “previously attended an elementary school or secondary school identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia’s accountability system.”

SEC. 8. PROGRAM EVALUATION.

(a) REVISION OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3009(a) (sec. 38-1853.09(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY AND THE MAYOR.—The Secretary and the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall—

“(A) jointly enter into an agreement with the Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education to evaluate annually the opportunity scholarship program under this division;

“(B) jointly enter into an agreement to monitor and evaluate the use of funds authorized and appropriated for the District of Columbia public schools and the District of Columbia public charter schools under this division; and

“(C) make the evaluations described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) public in accordance with subsection (c).

“(2) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary, through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, shall—

“(A) ensure that the evaluation under paragraph (1)(A)—

“(i) is conducted using an acceptable quasi-experimental research design for determining the effectiveness of the opportunity scholarship program under this division that does not use a control study group consisting of students who applied for but did not receive opportunity scholarships; and

“(ii) addresses the issues described in paragraph (4); and

“(B) disseminate information on the impact of the program—

“(i) in increasing academic achievement and educational attainment of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship; and

“(ii) on students and schools in the District of Columbia.

“(3) DUTIES OF THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES.—The Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education shall—

“(A) assess participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship in each of grades 3 through 8, as well as one of the grades at the high school level, by supervising the administration of the same reading and mathematics assessment used by the District of Columbia public schools to comply with section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b));

“(B) measure the academic achievement of all participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship in the grades described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) work with eligible entities receiving a grant under this division to ensure that the parents of each student who is a participating eligible student that uses an opportunity scholarship agrees to permit their child to participate in the evaluations and assessments carried out by the Institute of Education Sciences under this subsection.

“(4) ISSUES TO BE EVALUATED.—The issues to be evaluated under paragraph (1)(A) shall include the following:

“(A) A comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship on the measurements described in paragraph (3)(B) to the academic achievement of a comparison group of students with similar backgrounds in the District of Columbia public schools.

“(B) The success of the program under this division in expanding choice options for parents of participating eligible students and increasing the satisfaction of such parents and students with their choice.

“(C) The reasons parents of participating eligible students choose for their children to participate in the program, including important characteristics for selecting schools.

“(D) A comparison of the retention rates, high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship with the rates of students in the comparison group described in subparagraph (A).

“(E) A comparison of the college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of students who participated in the program in 2004, 2005, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 as the result of winning the Opportunity Scholarship Program lottery with such enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates for students who entered but did not win such lottery in those years and who, as a result, served as the control group for previous evaluations of the program under this division. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to waive section 3004(a)(3)(A)(iii) with respect to any such student.

“(F) A comparison of the safety of the schools attended by participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship and the schools in the District of Columbia attended by students in the comparison group described in subparagraph (A), based on the perceptions of the students and parents.

“(G) An assessment of student academic achievement at participating schools in which 85 percent of the total number of students enrolled at the school are participating eligible students who receive and use an opportunity scholarship.

“(H) Such other issues with respect to participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship as the Secretary considers appropriate for inclusion in the evaluation, such as the impact of the program on public elementary schools and secondary schools in the District of Columbia.

“(5) PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any disclosure of personally identifiable information obtained under this division shall be in compliance with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the ‘Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974’) (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

“(B) STUDENTS NOT ATTENDING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—With respect to any student who is not attending a public elementary school or secondary school, personally identifiable

information obtained under this division shall only be disclosed to—

“(i) individuals carrying out the evaluation described in paragraph (1)(A) for such student;

“(ii) the group of individuals providing information for carrying out the evaluation of such student; and

“(iii) the parents of such student.”.

(2) TRANSITION OF EVALUATION.—

(A) TERMINATION OF PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary of Education shall—

(i) terminate the evaluations conducted under section 3009(a) of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (sec. 38–1853.09(a), D.C. Official Code), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, after obtaining data for the 2016–2017 school year; and

(ii) submit any reports required for the 2016–2017 school year or preceding years with respect to the evaluations in accordance with section 3009(b) of such Act.

(B) NEW EVALUATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with respect to the 2017–2018 school year, the Secretary shall conduct new evaluations in accordance with the provisions of section 3009(a) of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (sec. 38–1853.09(a), D.C. Official Code), as amended by this Act.

(ii) MOST RECENT EVALUATION.—As a component of the new evaluations described in clause (i), the Secretary shall continue to monitor and evaluate the students who were evaluated in the most recent evaluation under such section prior to the date of enactment of this Act, including by monitoring and evaluating the test scores and other information of such students.

(b) DUTY OF MAYOR TO ENSURE INSTITUTE HAS ALL INFORMATION NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT EVALUATIONS.—Section 3011(a)(1) (sec. 38–1853.11(a)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) INFORMATION NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT EVALUATIONS.—Ensure that all District of Columbia public schools and District of Columbia public charter schools make available to the Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education all of the information the Institute requires to carry out the assessments and perform the evaluations required under section 3009(a).”.

SEC. 9. FUNDING FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS.

(a) MANDATORY WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CONDITIONS.—Section 3011(b) (sec. 38–1853.11(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) ENFORCEMENT.—If, after reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary determines that the Mayor has failed to comply with any of the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary may withhold from the Mayor, in whole or in part—

“(1) the funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated under section 3014(a)(2), if the failure to comply relates to the District of Columbia public schools;

“(2) the funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated under section 3014(a)(3), if the failure to comply relates to the District of Columbia public charter schools; or

“(3) the funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated under both paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3014(a), if the failure relates to both the District of Columbia public schools and the District of Columbia public charter schools.”.

(b) RULES FOR USE OF FUNDS PROVIDED FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS.—Section 3011 (sec. 38–1853.11, D.C. Official Code), as amended by section 7(b) and section 8(a), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) SPECIFIC RULES REGARDING FUNDS PROVIDED FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS.—The following rules shall apply with respect to the funds provided under this division for the support of District of Columbia public charter schools:

“(1) The Secretary may direct the funds provided for any fiscal year, or any portion thereof, to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia.

“(2) The Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia may transfer the funds to subgrantees that are—

“(A) specific District of Columbia public charter schools or networks of such schools; or

“(B) District of Columbia-based nonprofit organizations with experience in successfully providing support or assistance to District of Columbia public charter schools or networks of such schools.

“(3) The funds provided under this division for the support of District of Columbia public charter schools shall be available to any District of Columbia public charter school in good standing with the District of Columbia Charter School Board, and the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Charter School Board may not restrict the availability of such funds to certain types of schools on the basis of the school’s location, governing body, or the school’s facilities.”.

SEC. 10. REVISION OF CURRENT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

Not later than the beginning of the 2017–2018 school year, the Secretary of Education and the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall revise the memorandum of understanding which is in effect under section 3012(d) of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act as of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to address the following:

(1) The amendments made by this Act.

(2) The need to ensure that participating schools under the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act meet fire code standards and maintain certificates of occupancy.

(3) The need to ensure that District of Columbia public schools and District of Columbia public charter schools meet the requirements under such Act to comply with all reasonable requests for information necessary to carry out the evaluations required under section 3009(a) of such Act.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3013 (sec. 38–1853.13, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (11), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

“(1) CORE SUBJECT MATTER.—The term ‘core subject matter’ means—

“(A) mathematics;

“(B) science; and

“(C) English, reading, or language arts.”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(B)(ii), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by inserting “household with a” before “student”.

SEC. 12. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3014 (sec. 38–1853.14, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “and for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2021”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under subsection (a)(1), including amounts

appropriated and available under such subsection before the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, shall remain available until expended.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to school year 2017–2018 and each succeeding school year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4901.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are here to pass an important bill, Mr. Speaker. This bill is H.R. 4901, known as the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act, or SOAR.

The SOAR Act continues a three-sector approach to education within the District of Columbia. The bill provides equal funding to D.C. public schools, D.C. public charter schools, and the Opportunity Scholarship Program which is commonly known as the OSP.

The OSP provides scholarships to students of low-income families, many of whom would otherwise attend low-performing schools. This program is bringing about educational opportunities to those who need it most.

Now, to some, this may sound familiar because in October of last year, we considered H.R. 10, also a bill to reauthorize the SOAR Act. But H.R. 4901 is very similar to H.R. 10; however, after H.R. 10 passed the House, changes were made to it through a bipartisan negotiation with the Senate. These changes actually strengthened the bill, and we are pleased to support this today.

The new bill brings greater transparency and accountability to the OSP through increased reporting requirements. The new bill strengthens accreditation requirements, and the new bill clarifies congressional intent around the use of carryover funds and access to the OSP. Out of a commitment to regular order and the understanding of how important this legislation is, we wanted Members to have the opportunity to debate and vote on these changes, which we did in our committee, and it passed out of our

committee. Thus, we introduced H.R. 4901.

We improved the legislation, and now we are bringing it before the Chamber in an effort to pass the bill in its best possible form. I hope the House will see the value of this bill as it benefits families in the District, specifically low-income families in the District of Columbia.

The average income of a family with an OSP student is \$22,000 per year. Let me say that again. The average income of a family with an OSP student is \$22,000. This program offers these families more than just a scholarship, it is a lifeline. One OSP parent went so far as to describe the OSP as her salvation.

Mr. Speaker, the OSP is working. In the 2014–2015 school year, OSP students had a graduation rate of 90 percent. Ninety percent graduation rate. That should indicate to a lot of people that this thing is working. That is well above the national average of 82 percent and is certainly better than the average within the D.C. public schools, which is only about 64 percent.

However, I would be remiss if I did not note that the D.C. public schools increased their graduation rate 6 percentage points from 2014 to 2015, and we applaud that and hope that continues. That is in part because this three-sector approach is actually working.

Opponents of the SOAR Act want to stop this legislation because they disagree with the OSP for purely ideological reasons. In fact, opponents, just like their supporters, know that OSP students do as well, if not better, on every measure compared to the public school counterparts. Opponents will likely even support allowing current OSP students to remain in the program until they finish high school.

If the OSP is so bad, though, it makes no sense to allow children to remain in it. The truth is that the program works, and we should reauthorize it so it can work for even more children. Unfortunately, opponents of the OSP will seek to end the entire three-sector approach in an effort to simply stop the OSP.

I do want to note that the Washington, D.C., Mayor, the D.C. Council chairman, and seven other members of the D.C. Council sent a letter to the congressional leadership urging the reauthorization of this program. The Mayor and a majority of the D.C. Council recognize the value of this legislation and are asking that we stand with them and not forsake the children of the District of Columbia.

A March 2016 letter signed by the Mayor and 8 of the 13 Members of the D.C. Council supporting the SOAR Act will be entered into the RECORD. The letter states: “These funds are critical to the gains that the District’s public education system has seen in recent years.”

It goes on to note how important the SOAR Act has been in maintaining and recruiting quality teachers and principals. District officials show strong

support for this legislation, as does the Washington, D.C., community.

We are thrilled to have found common ground on this bill, and I welcome the District’s support. I thank them for their valuable work in getting this legislation to this point. I am also excited that the SOAR Act is supported by the Washington Post. I will be inserting in the RECORD a position they took on March 14, 2016, to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, the SOAR Act’s purpose is to improve education within the District, and I believe it is doing just that within public schools, charter schools, and the OSPs. It is providing families with a valuable choice, and it is allowing them to escape other situations that would not be nearly as conducive to their families.

I don’t understand why the critics of the OSP are so opposed to the program, especially since it produces graduation rates far above the national average. This feat is even more notable when you realize that the OSP achieves better graduation rates than D.C. public schools at only two-thirds of the cost, so you get better graduation rates, and it is two-thirds of the cost of D.C. public schools.

I recognize the importance of our public education system and the need for public school improvement. That is why the legislation also authorizes funds for public education. We must recognize the reality before us. This past year, D.C. eighth graders had the lowest test scores in the Nation in math and reading, some of the most critical skills that they need to be successful in life. While D.C. public schools have made progress, clearly, much remains to be done.

Mr. Speaker, students within the District should not have to wait for these changes to come about. They deserve an alternative, a quality education, and they deserve it now. Let’s work to improve public education in the District, but let’s not hold back current students while those improvements happen. Let’s allow them every opportunity available, such as an opportunity scholarship.

We are here today to debate a bill that works in every way to further the educational outcomes of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, also let me just take a personal note to thank Speaker Boehner for his passion on this issue. For years he has championed this. He has done it in his private time, he did it in his public life, he did it as a Member of Congress, and he did it as the Speaker of the House. This was his. He championed this. It has been successful, and I am glad to carry the baton and make sure that there is school choice within Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a mother, I believe parents should seize any and every educational opportunity available to their

children, so I certainly have no criticism of my own constituents who have seized this opportunity. In fact, in order to avoid disruption of the education of the current voucher students, I believe they should be allowed to remain in the program until high school graduation, and President Obama has offered a compromise to allow them to do so.

Consideration of this bill surely is unprecedented. Until today, I had never seen the House vote on virtually the same bill a second time in the same Congress, and that is about to happen here. The House, acted in October.

Why is this House acting redundantly again? Shouldn't the focus be on the Republican-led Senate where neither this bill—which is virtually the same as the bill that was passed before—nor its Senate companion has moved?

Last December, the Senate committee of jurisdiction canceled a scheduled markup of the bill to protect Republicans from this bill and especially from the civil rights amendments that had been proposed to the bill. Just last month, Chairman CHAFFETZ himself—who is the chairman of the authorizing committee, and the subcommittee—requested that the bill be included in the upcoming—the upcoming—2017 appropriation bill because the chairman, knows that legislation on an appropriation is how this bill is going to be passed.

The problem is that there is little congressional support for vouchers except for vouchers in the District of Columbia, where nobody can vote for anybody except this Member. Congress has refused to create a national voucher program. Just last year during reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, both the House and the Senate voted on several national voucher amendments, and each failed. So you see, they don't want vouchers in their own districts.

Moreover, the Congress has never authorized the D.C. voucher program in the light of day. When Congress first created the program in 2004, and then reauthorized it in 2011, it did so by adding the voucher bill as riders to appropriations bills. And to protect Republican Senators running for reelection this year, that is what is going to happen again. The Senate has never passed a standalone D.C. vouchers bill, and yet it is being reauthorized now for the third time.

In this Congress alone, Republicans have introduced legislation to overturn D.C.'s gun safety laws, its laws on reproductive health, its laws on non-discrimination, its laws on marijuana, on labor, on immigration, and on education. It is, therefore, ironic to hear Republicans favorably cite the support of some D.C. government officials for passage of this bill.

Now, let me explain that because I don't want my colleagues to get away with mischaracterizing the position of the D.C. government on the bill before us today. When the House voted this

bill last year, a majority of the D.C. Council wrote to Congress opposed to this voucher program. Last month, however, fearing the loss of \$40 million for public and charter schools, a bare majority wrote in support of this bill. You can't blame them.

I must say though, I am being hoisted on my own petard here. Ironically, the funding for public schools and public charter schools exists only because during the creation of the voucher program, I repeatedly said that funding for public and charter schools was the preference of D.C. residents. To his everlasting credit, the then-Archbishop of Washington then insisted that public and charter schools also receive funding in conjunction with the voucher funding.

The D.C. Mayor and a bare majority this year of the council sent a carefully crafted letter supporting this bill because they knew they were writing for the residents of the District of Columbia who do not support vouchers. Their letter did not support the voucher program itself, but referred only to the bill's public and charter school funding.

□ 0930

Those who signed the letter, by the way, were even more concerned that the Congress, instead, could pass the radical Cruz-Meadows bill, which would permit D.C. students to use local funds, commandeer local funds, from the D.C. treasury to pay for private schools.

City officials recognized—and who can blame them—that Republicans have conditioned reauthorization of the public and charter school funding on reauthorization of the voucher funding. I understand their concern about losing public and charter school funding because it has been part of the city's education budget for a decade.

There is, of course, no reason for a unique Federal voucher program in the District of Columbia, in particular. According to the study of the program's effectiveness mandated by Congress, by statute, the D.C. voucher program has failed in its stated purpose. That purpose was to improve academic achievement. The voucher program has not improved academic achievement, as measured by math and reading test scores of students overall or of students the program prioritized from low-performing public schools.

Republicans, rightly, were disappointed with these results, so guess what they did. Instead of getting rid of a failed program, they simply changed the evaluation. The prior reauthorizations required the program's evaluation to be "conducted using the strongest possible research designed," and a randomized controlled trial—the gold standard—was therefore used.

It is almost laughable when somebody changes the test in order to pass it. In contrast, this bill requires the evaluation to be conducted—this time—using an acceptable—that means any acceptable—"quasi-experimental

research design" and expressly prohibits the randomized controlled trial that was mandated before.

This dishonesty is transparent, Mr. Speaker. As researchers conducting an evaluation of the program point out, a randomized controlled study "is especially important in the context of school choice because families wanting to apply for a choice program may have educational goals and aspirations that differ from the average family."

The voucher program is also unnecessary. The District of Columbia has an unusually robust public school choice system, and it is available to every student. Now, I would wager that the District's choice system is the best in the Nation, and here is what it is.

Almost 50 percent of our children go to charter schools. Those charter schools were authorized when I worked with Speaker Newt Gingrich to allow charter schools instead of vouchers to be the District's alternative school system. For the public schools, 75 percent of our children attend out-of-boundary public schools that they have chosen. So I ask any Member who has public choice that robust to make himself known during this debate.

The D.C. voucher program also exempts students from protection of Federal civil rights laws that apply to public and federally funded programs. Under the voucher program, the Federal funding is considered assistance to the voucher student and not to the school, apparently in order to avoid these important mandates for our schools. Therefore, the program is not considered a federally funded program, although the money comes from Federal funds.

This program is exempt from title IV and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, from title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, from the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Everybody knows that this program is going to be reauthorized as a rider on an appropriations bill, which is how the D.C. vouchers bill has always been enacted, in 2004 and again in 2011.

This is a masquerade here this morning. I am sorry Members had to be held over. This could have been taken care of yesterday. Even if the bill is not reauthorized, however, everyone expects that Republicans will continue to fund the three sectors, as they have always done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is correct that the Republicans have continued to fund the three-sector approach in Washington, D.C., and I am proud of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4901, the

Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act.

I want to commend Chairman CHAFFETZ for his work on this important policy and for continuing the legacy of former Speaker Boehner on this important issue.

Make no mistake about it, thousands of kids have access to the American Dream because of Speaker Boehner's dedication to the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program and education choice across the country.

I met one of those students in February during a hearing on Capitol Hill. Her name was Denisha Merriweather. Denisha provided some powerful testimony that I will not soon forget. She spoke of being locked in a failing school, and she said: "When I was growing up, college was a dream that I didn't even know that I had, and if it weren't for an educational option Florida gave me 12 years ago, I wouldn't be here today."

Ms. Merriweather is the first in her family to graduate from high school and college, and she is now attending graduate school. That is powerful stuff, and it is just one example of the thousands of young people in America whose lives have been changed by school choice.

As chairman of the Congressional School Choice Caucus, I believe every child in America deserves the same kind of opportunity that Denisha had. But right now, for the majority of students in this country, real educational choice only exists if you can afford it.

Ask yourself this question: If your local school is failing your child and you can't afford to move and you can't afford to pay for private school, what options do you really have?

Make no mistake about it, that is the truth for thousands of key people here in Washington, D.C., and, frankly, all across the country. They are locked in a failing school that is failing their child, and they can't afford to move and they can't afford to pay for a private school. They are stuck.

That is why school choice and the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program matters. Programs like D.C. OSP empower parents to choose the best educational environment for their child, regardless of their income, their ZIP Code, or their lot in life. And despite some of the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, this program takes zero dollars from D.C. Public Schools—zero dollars. Yet D.C. OSP has a big impact on D.C. students. In fact, the program lets more than 6,000 students attend the school that gives them the best opportunity to succeed. And even better, an incredible 90 percent—90 percent—of D.C. OSP students graduate from high school on time, an incredible success.

It turns out that empowering parents and empowering students works. We have miles to go before every kid in America has access to a great school. This issue is far bigger than just D.C. schools. But today's bill will ensure that thousands of kids in Washington,

D.C., have an opportunity, and every one of those kids matter.

This bill is worthy of our support. I ask my colleagues for their support.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is so concerned about the millions of parents who can't afford to send their children to private schools, his caucus had the perfect opportunity this year, because they have such a strong majority, to, in fact, pass voucher amendments, and they refused to do so for their own schools.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my friend.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the District of Columbia for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 4901.

Contrary to its title and contrary to what you just heard, this voucher program for schoolchildren in the District of Columbia has neither expanded opportunities nor delivered results for those students and their families. It has actually proven to be an unwise and unwelcome use of tax dollars, which ought to be of great concern to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Yet, rather than call for increased scrutiny, they are forcing the House to once again vote on a bill on which this Chamber has already acted.

In successive reports on the effectiveness of this program, the Department of Education has determined that students using these vouchers saw no statistically significant improvement in their overall achievement in math or reading—none.

In addition, the Department found that both parents and students from schools in need of improvement, the program's intended beneficiaries, reported that their experience with the voucher program did not—not—improve their level of satisfaction with the education system or the education they were receiving.

I also find it extremely cynical that this reauthorization would weaken the very reporting requirements that have shown this program to be ineffective. When you don't like the findings, I guess we suppress them.

Further, the Government Accountability Office has cited the program for not having sufficient financial controls and accountability measures, something I thought we favored. For example, the D.C. Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation, which administers the program, repeatedly failed to comply with statutory financial reporting deadlines, and its "policies and procedures lack detail in several areas related to school compliance and financial accounting" to ensure Federal tax dollars are being used in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I also hope the great irony of this legislation is not lost on my colleagues. Those who claim to support the conservative principles of small government would again authorize \$60 million in taxpayer subsidies for a program that has failed to meet ex-

pectations for both educational achievement and financial stewardship. I guess there are carve-outs for our ideological favorites.

Further, self-proclaimed states' rights conservatives are once again willing to impose the will of Congress on a local government—the District of Columbia—and they do it because they can. So much for Big Brother; so much for telling somebody we know best.

Finally, I want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle of the principles they espoused just last year when we worked in bipartisan fashion to pass legislation reforming No Child Left Behind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONNOLLY. In their own explanatory material for the Every Student Succeeds Act, Republicans say the new reforms are intended to restore local control by returning responsibility for accountability and school improvement to State and local leaders. Why doesn't that apply here? Another ideological carve-out, Mr. Speaker.

Congress has no business imposing its will on the schools and families of the District of Columbia in this fashion. They are not guinea pigs for our ideological favorites.

□ 0945

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. KLINE. I thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, which will renew our vital investment in the children who live in the District of Columbia.

In passing the Every Student Succeeds Act last year, we took important steps to support and encourage greater school choice for students and their families. These reforms empower parents to do what is best for their children's education, and they help ensure that all children are able to receive the excellent education they deserve regardless of their family's background, income, or ZIP Code. Helping students escape failing schools so they can pursue brighter futures is an important priority, and that is exactly what the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program does for children in our Nation's Capital.

For more than 10 years now, the program has enabled thousands of students to pursue the quality education necessary to excel both in the classroom and later in life—and excel they do. In fact, last year, 90 percent of 12th graders who received a scholarship through the program graduated from high school, and nearly 90 percent of them, Mr. Speaker, went on to pursue college degrees. The traditional D.C.

public school system can make no such claim. These are very impressive results. Despite the claims of those who oppose these schools for, apparently, purely ideological, partisan reasons, with results like these—90 percent graduate, and 90 percent of those go on to college—it makes those claims that these schools are not performing well, frankly, laughable.

This legislation also authorizes support for D.C. public schools, and it will provide critical resources for its charter schools. I agree with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia that the public charter schools in the District are performing well. They are giving some hope to mothers and fathers and grandmothers and grandfathers that their children will have a chance in life. I am very proud of those public charter schools. There are also parents—Presidents of the United States and so forth—who choose to send their kids to private schools, and that opportunity ought to exist for more children—for more students—in the District of Columbia. That is what the Opportunity Scholarship Program does. It provides another chance—another avenue, another road to hope—for children in our Nation's Capital.

Together, these measures are working to improve the traditional public schools that are struggling and that are still, too often, failing students—which is why there is a waiting line to get into charter schools and into private schools—and will make a positive impact in the lives of students across the District and will create much-needed educational opportunities for these children.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want the gentleman from Minnesota to know that there are waiting lines in the District of Columbia to get into many D.C. public schools and, of course, into many charter schools. We also know nothing about the schools that tell us 90 percent of their children graduate because this House has no information on them. What we do know is that the randomized study took children in D.C. public schools and compared them to students at exactly the same levels in the voucher schools—no difference in overall achievement. That is how we measure achievement in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4901, which would reauthorize the D.C. voucher program, known as the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, through 2021.

We don't spend enough money on education, so it is hard to justify diverting scarce public resources in order to finance private school education for

a handful of students at the expense of the vast majority who attend public schools. Instead, we should focus our limited public resources on initiatives that improve education for all of our children. This is the promise of a public school education in the United States, but the voucher programs undermine that promise while hiding behind the guise of school choice for students in need.

There are about 50 participating schools in the Washington, D.C., Opportunity Scholarship Program, but more than half of all of the participants are enrolled in just eight schools. Most of the schools in the program have higher tuition than the voucher covers, limiting the utility of the voucher and shifting the cost of education to the families that can't afford it—essentially, denying the opportunity to students whose families cannot afford the remainder of the tuition. Federal dollars are being provided to a small number of parents who can afford the choice and to others with students who are already enrolled in private schools when that money could have been used for our public school systems.

Although there are a few who can participate in the program, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia said, the results are disappointing. Research consistently demonstrates that the D.C. voucher program is an ineffective program that does not increase achievement. The four reports produced by the Department of Education found no improvement in reading and math after entering the voucher program for students coming from the most struggling D.C. public schools, nor did they find any statistically significant difference in math and reading academic performance from D.C. public schools. On average, Mr. Speaker, these schools are, at best, average.

When you cite statistics that say some may be doing well, you have to take into consideration that these are children from families who are very supportive of their children and that they would be doing well whether they were in the voucher program or not.

In addition to the disappointing results, we also found the voucher participants were less likely to have access to English language programs, special education supports, counselors, and other vital supports that ensure that all students remain on the path of academic success.

If the schools are not producing the promised results, why are we providing them with unrestricted Federal dollars?

Mr. Speaker, we could have improved the bill. We have a closed rule, so amendments were not allowed, but there were several amendments that should have been considered that I had offered. One would have protected the civil rights of students at schools that receive vouchers by requiring schools to certify that they provide each student with applicable civil rights pro-

tections. Another would have required any school receiving funds under this program to comply with the same Federal data and reporting requirements that all public schools or other schools receiving Federal money have to provide. All of our congressional districts provide this information, but, unfortunately, it is not required under the voucher program.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to spend \$20 million to fund education in the District of Columbia, we ought to use it to improve education for everyone, not just for a few. This bill uses the money to help a few parents by subsidizing tuition in private schools, which many were already attending, at the expense of many, and it extends a program that fails to actually improve the education for students in Washington, D.C.

I join the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia in opposing this legislation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, the graduation rate in the D.C. public schools is 64 percent. The graduation rate at the OSP program is 90 percent. Those are results, and they are worth every penny.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, there are few times in this House that we can see an immediate impact from legislation. A few months ago, I remember meeting some families who were given a choice in the SOAR Act. I remember seeing the pride in their faces, but what I remember most was the hope they had—a hope that was new, a new hope in the future. America has always been about opportunity. The SOAR Act does exactly what it says in its title—Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act. The SOAR Act is impacting lives today, but it is changing lives forever.

Upward mobility starts with a strong education. It reminds me of my background in working with some gospel music arrangers. I was surprised at the high volume of sales in this particular industry, and one of the arrangers summed it up this way. He said: "Mark, ain't nobody likes it but the people."

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who oppose the SOAR Act and who oppose parents in having this opportunity, let me say this: Ain't nobody likes it but the people.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Utah has 16 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Public schools in the United States and big cities are improving, and it should be noted that the D.C. Public Schools district continues to be the fastest improving urban school district

in the United States, according to data released from the 2015 Trial Urban District Assessment. These schools deserve support. They are improving test scores unlike the voucher schools. In comparing the randomized study of those who wanted the voucher and didn't get it and who remained in the District public school system with those who wanted the voucher and got it, there was no difference in their math and English scores.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that point, if you select students from families who can afford the tuition and who are very supportive of their students, is it a surprise that they may do better in graduation rates than the average?

Ms. NORTON. In reclaiming my time, the gentleman has brought up a very important point.

By the way, some of the students who accept this voucher are already in the private schools, so they already could obviously afford the program. They are already attending the voucher schools, and they have now gotten vouchers. If you have some free Federal money, let me have some.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Would they be expected to do better, with their supportive families, than the average?

Ms. NORTON. In reclaiming my time, I think they would be because they have families behind them, and they are being compared with students who often do not.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The gentleman pointed out that, with the randomized studies, there was no difference in the public schools and the voucher programs. Those studies are the conclusion of vigorous research that there was no difference; is that right?

Ms. NORTON. In reclaiming my time, there was no difference, and yet improving academic performance was a stated reason for the voucher program.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in opposing the reauthorization of the D.C. voucher program.

Public schools are the foundation of the American education system. They represent a duty we have to provide every student in every community with an education that helps them realize their full potential. Vouchers prevent us from fulfilling that duty by redirecting taxpayer money away from our public schools, which are already underfunded, and into private institutions that do not open their doors to every child.

As with previous versions of the SOAR Act, this bill does nothing to ensure that students with disabilities

have access to private schools. It also discriminates against low-income families. In 64 percent of the participating D.C. schools, the tuition costs more than the voucher can cover, which, effectively, excludes families who cannot afford to pay the difference. Even students who can afford to attend private school can be excluded based on their prior academic achievement, language ability, or other discriminatory factors. I had hoped we could address these concerns through the amendment process, but the majority has not allowed amendments to the bill.

You would expect private schools that can choose their own students to have exceptional records of student performance, but you would be wrong. Since 2007, there have been four congressionally mandated reports on the D.C. voucher program's impact on student achievement. Not one of those reports found a significant improvement in reading or math scores among participants.

Mr. Speaker, with the Every Student Succeeds Act, we are entering a new era in education policy that holds real promise for students and educators across the country. We should be focusing our attention and resources on improving institutions that serve all students.

I call on my colleagues to remember the obligation we have to every child and reject H.R. 4901.

□ 1000

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the Civil War, Lincoln addressed the Ohio regiment and he said that the beauty of a free government is that it gives every individual an open field and fair chance for their intelligence, enterprise, and industry to flourish.

That was something that he could speak of firsthand because he had grown up in the backwater. When you start talking about places like Illinois and Kentucky, that was so far removed from the corridors of power at that time and then he ends up being the President of the United States, that would have been unheard of in a country in Europe.

I think right now, when you look at our country, you have people who are born and you are supposed to be able to make the most of your God-given abilities, no matter your circumstances. Some people are born into privileged circumstances, and some people aren't. But if they have the desire to succeed, they need to be able to do that in America.

Yet, what we find now is there are so many kids who grow up in communities that have really failing school systems, and I think the number one thing to be able to better yourself in our modern society is with education.

Now, of course, the Federal Government doesn't have jurisdiction over K-12 education for the States, and I think

that that is proper. I think, at times, the Federal Government has needed into that, and I think it has been counterproductive.

We do have jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. You have some families who are really in dire straits. There is a big D.C. bureaucracy that is not performing up to expectations. So this program is a lifeline to those families.

The average income is \$22,000 a year, which is not a lot in any community, but in Washington that is very, very little. It gives them a lifeline to be able to have an alternative school and maybe be able to make the most of their God-given ability.

Look, if the public school bureaucracy is doing well, then they can choose that. But if it is not and it is not working for them, then this gives them another option.

This is something that—having done the hearing at the school like we did on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, these are kids who are thrilled to be in these schools. I am just very happy to support this effort. I appreciate the chairman's work on this. We need to give every child the chance to succeed.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I proudly support the reauthorization of the SOAR Act because the SOAR Act provides the choice that parents in the District deserve. I supported H.R. 10 and I now support H.R. 4901, which made important improvements to H.R. 10.

This legislation we are considering today continues to empower low-income families in D.C. to take advantage of opportunities they may not otherwise be able to do. That is because H.R. 4901 is a bill that focuses on people, public schools, charter schools, Opportunity Scholarship Program, people with choices in each of those areas.

The SOAR Act is about improving the lives of students and families in the District in a profoundly personal way. Isn't that what true education is all about: personal achievement, improvement, and opportunity?

Take the story of Carlos Battle, as written about in the National Journal and a recent book on educational choice. Carlos received a scholarship through the OSP and attended Assumption Catholic School and then Georgetown Day School for high school.

As a result of this quality education, by choice, Carlos was able to attend Northeastern University in Boston. In fact, his mother says Carlos "almost surely wouldn't have gone to college" without the scholarship.

Carlos now talks about how many of his friends from his time in public school are still in the neighborhood and not doing well for themselves, and he said some even are in jail.

As he puts it: Everyone who was in my sixth grade class had the potential to achieve just as much as I did . . . that's just the unfortunate truth.

The OSP allowed Carlos to take advantage of his potential, and he kept on achieving all the way to Northeastern.

While in Boston, Carlos has spent time working at a nonprofit, helping give back to Boston public school students by helping them prepare for responsibilities of college where he has been able to lead workshops for public school students on college preparedness.

He is currently preparing to pursue a Ph.D. in a career as a child psychologist, and that would be an appropriate time for an applause line.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as I begin my remarks, I know that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia would understand my sense of pride in acknowledging that, in my district, the Victory Early College High School, which is in the Acres Homes neighborhood and a part of the Aldine Independent School District, a public school, will be celebrating the National Blue Ribbon award ceremony this morning. I offer them congratulations and express my disappointment for not being there.

Obviously, they have been recognized as one of two schools in Houston nationally to earn the distinction of a National Blue Ribbon School at an awards ceremony in Washington, D.C., for closing the achievement gap. May I remind my colleagues that that is a public school system.

So I rise in opposition and join my colleague from the District of Columbia to oppose H.R. 4901, which would reauthorize the District of Columbia private school voucher program and the Opportunity Scholarship Program for 5 years.

The OSP program came about in 2004. In 2011, Congress reauthorized the OSP through fiscal year 2016. Under the SOAR Act, D.C. households with incomes that do not exceed 185 percent of the poverty line may receive an annual maximum voucher payment per student of \$3,000 for grades K-8 and \$12,000 for grades 9-12.

We all know that private schools are much more expensive than that. So, in essence, this creates a small class that pays money to schools that have not been assessed as to whether or not they are quality schools. Private schools can cost as much as \$50,000. Are we giving them \$50,000 while we are dumping

down the public school system? What is so disturbing is: Where is the data?

This bill, in particular, makes a significant change. The bill prohibits a control study group in making evaluations of the OSP and requires a less rigorous quasi-experimental research design than under the SOAR Act. Since 2004, almost \$200 million has been spent on D.C. voucher schools. Can you imagine what we would be able to do if that money was invested?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what that could do?

I hear that 50 percent of D.C. children are in charter schools, but 50 percent of children in D.C. are using The Choice Program. What are we doing in America? By using this as a scapegoat, we are suggesting that we are not invested in public schools.

Finally, the D.C. Mayor and City Council members, as I understand, were only advocating that: If you don't fund the voucher program, don't leave us out for the public and charter school program. There is a vigorous Choice Program in D.C.

This bill undermines the public school system for all of us, and we should oppose the bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4901, the Scholarship for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act. As many will remember, the House passed a similar bill, H.R. 10, last year with 240 votes.

H.R. 4901 makes three specific changes to H.R. 10 to ensure the D.C. scholarship program continues to run efficiently and effectively for the foreseeable future.

First, this bill creates additional reporting requirements for the administrator of the scholarship program to ensure that the program is operating effectively.

Second, it requires that any District of Columbia school that participates in this scholarship program must be accredited.

Finally, the Department of Education has been withholding funds from the scholarship program and excluding qualified students from participating.

H.R. 4901 ensures that the Department of Education cannot withhold funds from the scholarship program and that they cannot exclude students that are qualified to participate.

With these changes, this D.C. school scholarship program can continue to run efficiently and allow low-income families to better their educational experience and opportunities.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 4901.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the SOAR Act. I want to talk for a moment about the elephant in the room, and that is the way in which it has become something of a tug of war between those who believe in choice in education and those who don't.

I think that, on the one hand, you have, for instance, taxpayer advocates who say: Wait a minute. If we are spending about \$30,000 per student and getting the results that we are out of the system, something ought to change.

There are other people who are advocates for the children of D.C., people like the former Mayor of this city, Anthony Williams, who said: Wait a minute. The scholarship program worked and it made a difference in people's lives.

There are people who are advocates for the marketplace who say: Wait a minute. There has been a revolutionary degree of change in technology and in output and in productivity as a result of marketplace forces, and maybe those marketplace forces ought to be at work in education as well.

I think, most of all, there are folks who acknowledge the fact that God makes every child different and that one size never fits all with the plethora of different personalities in children that are out there.

On the other hand, you have folks who say: Wait a minute. Let's do it the way we have always done it. We had schools set up this way in the 1970s, in the 1980s, in the 1990s, and in the 2000s. Let's do it the way we did it.

But, in that process, kids may be locked into schools that aren't working for them and for their families. They may be literally imprisoned in schools that aren't working.

So I think that what stands out about the SOAR Act is that it represents a set of keys so that kids would have additional choices. If we really believe that education is the cornerstone to opportunity in the 21st century, why not give kids as many keys as possible?

It could be a key to a charter school, a traditional public school, or a private school. It is a key of their choice because kids are indeed so different. That is what this bill acknowledges.

I commend the gentleman from Utah for what he has done on this front.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding

and for his work on this important legislation.

As a proud member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I rise today in support of H.R. 4901, the Scholarship for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act, also known as the SOAR Act.

This legislation would reauthorize the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides scholarships to low-income students so they may attend a D.C. private school of their parents' choice.

School choice is an effective tool that has proven to be successful in Washington, D.C. These scholarships have resulted in a 90 percent graduation rate, which is simply outstanding. I congratulate them on this.

Both of my parents were educators who instilled in me the importance of a good education, and I believe we should extend this opportunity to those who might not otherwise have it.

God created every child to be unique. As such, this legislation gives opportunities to students to receive an education chosen by their parents, those who know their child's needs best.

I encourage my colleagues to stand up in support of school choice and the SOAR Act to empower both parents and the students.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

□ 1015

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her advocacy for every child in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, last year we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, a good bill, but instead of figuring out how to fund this bipartisan bill through our budget and appropriations process, which apparently has broken down, we are here in a legislative déjà vu re-debating a nearly identical bad bill we passed just months ago that will take money away from our public schools.

I am well aware of these attempts to divert money away from public schools and the failures of taxpayer-funded private schools. In the last 10 years, Wisconsin taxpayers have wasted \$139 million of taxpayer dollars on private schools that were later terminated from the voucher program due to their lack of appropriate standards and accountability.

Further, in Wisconsin, 79 percent of the students who received a taxpayer-subsidized voucher in 2013 were already attending private schools. The SOAR Act would allow kids already in private schools to receive this funding. That means taxpayer dollars are being used not to advocate education, but instead as a form of tax policy. What is worse is that the taxpayer-funded voucher schools both in my State and here in D.C. are not providing equitable resources to special needs students with disabilities.

At the end of the day, this is also about results. Multiple Department of

Education studies have concluded that the taxpayer-funded D.C. voucher program has failed to improve educational outcomes for participating students, and two U.S. Government Accountability Office reports have also identified its repeated management and accountability failures. Public funds should be used for public education which serves all students. It is that simple. I encourage everyone to oppose this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. NORTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to be funded, and you can't blame the District of Columbia for wanting the public school and charter school funding that is in the bill. This bill is going to be funded. It was a Boehner bill, now it is essentially a Ryan bill, and I do want that understood.

I include in the RECORD the Council's letter from last year which opposed funding.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairperson, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

CHAIRPERSON CHAFFETZ: We write as locally elected officials to express our opposition to renewed efforts to expand a federally funded school voucher program in the District of Columbia. We appreciate your interest in providing support to public education in the District. We strongly believe, however, that federal funds should be invested in the existing public education system—both public schools and public charter schools—rather than being diverted to private schools.

We support the decision by Congress and the President several years ago to phase out the voucher program. Multiple U.S. Department of Education reports indicate that the program has not lived up to the promises made by proponents. These studies along with two troubling Government Accountability Office reports have also revealed that many of the students participating in the voucher program attend private schools with fewer resources and lower standards than our public schools. The evidence is clear that the use of vouchers has had no statistically significant impact on overall student achievement in math or reading, or for students from schools in need of improvement.

We have serious concerns about using government funds to send our students to private schools that do not have to adhere to the same standards and accountability as do public and public charter schools. For example, private religious schools, which 80% of students with vouchers attend, operate outside the non-discrimination provisions of the D.C. Human Rights Act. Moreover, the voucher proposal is inequitable: if fully funded, the authorization would provide many more dollars per student for vouchers than is allocated per student in public schools and public charter schools.

Although we believe that students who are already receiving a voucher should have the opportunity to maintain and use that voucher through graduation from high school, we do not support expansion of the program to new students. The District devotes consider-

able funds to public education, and our local policies promote choice for parents. Indeed, over the past decade the quality of public education in D.C. has increased, as a result of reforms and targeted investment. Families can choose from an array of educational institutions based on publicly-available performance metrics, both within the D.C. Public Schools system and among the myriad public charter schools. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan has called the progress of D.C. Public Schools "remarkable", while the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools has ranked the District's charter sector as the best in the country.

Despite such ample evidence that the Congressionally imposed voucher program is ineffective, while D.C. public schools improve every year, some members of Congress continue to see our city as their personal petri dish. It is insulting to our constituents, who vote for us but not for any voting member of Congress, that some of your colleagues push their personal agendas on D.C. in a way they could never do in their home states. Attacking D.C. home rule, including any expansion of the voucher program, is irresponsible governing on the part of Congress.

We call on you to respect the wishes of the District's elected officials on the quintessentially local matter of education as you consider this issue.

Sincerely,

DAVID GROSSO,
D.C. Council, At-Large, Chairperson, Committee on Education.

CHARLES ALLEN,
D.C. Council, Ward 6, Member, Committee on Education.

LARUBY MAY,
D.C. Council, Ward 8.

ELISSA SILVERMAN,
D.C. Council, At-Large.

ANITA BONDS,
D.C. Council, At-Large, Member, Committee on Education.

YVETTE ALEXANDER,
D.C. Council, Ward 7, Member, Committee on Education.

BRIANNE NADEAU,
D.C. Council, Ward 1.

JACK EVANS,
D.C. Council, Ward 2.

Ms. NORTON. This year, of course, recognizing that they might lose \$40 million, there was another bill, and a bare majority said: Give us the money.

But I want you to understand what the letter from the District of Columbia said.

"A reauthorization of the SOAR Act would help safeguard \$150 million in Federal funds for the D.C. Public Schools and public charter schools over 5 years."

And they go on to say: "SOAR Act funding for D.C. Public Schools has been used to support initiatives that reward and increase retention of high performing teachers and principals. The funds also help attract more high quality teachers and principals to D.C. Public Schools and improve the efficiency with which schools are run."

"After years of decline, D.C. public school enrollment is rising for the first time in decades. Schools that previously struggled to fill their pre-kindergarten seats have waiting lists and

other schools are attracting families back into the system at grade levels that have historically lost students.”

Clearly, we have a school system—and I cannot help but identify with them—that does not want to lose \$40 million for D.C. public schools and D.C. charter schools. I don’t ask anybody to change their vote. This program is going to be funded.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, let me read the first sentence of the first paragraph from the D.C. Mayor, as well as the majority of the Council. “As Mayor and members of the Council of the District of Columbia, we support the three-sector Federal funding approach for D.C.’s K–12 education system that is authorized in the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results, the SOAR Act.”

It is clear this is producing results. I find it a little bit troubling when the opposition to the SOAR Act people stand up and say: Well, it is not producing results.

I will reiterate again that the average graduation rate at the D.C. public schools is 64 percent. The graduation rate for somebody who obtains the scholarship is 90 percent, and 92 percent of those people who get that scholarship go on to college. Those are laudable goals in any, any scenario.

And while this is done, this education is literally two-thirds of the cost, and it goes to people who really do deserve and need it, because the average annual income for somebody who is a recipient of this scholarship is \$22,000. A \$22,000 income in the District of Columbia for someone with kids is difficult, at best.

I want to thank, again, Speaker Boehner for his passion on school choice and particularly the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship. I also want to thank our Senate colleague, Senator TIM SCOTT. Senator SCOTT joined us in a field hearing that we had in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. He is a true believer and is passionate about school choice and the need to give everybody the best possible opportunities that we can.

So I think we have had a good debate. We had a good markup and discussion within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I hope that we pass this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 4901, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results (SOAR) Reauthorization Act.

Members of Congress, believe that together—the key to the future of our great nation is the quality of the education we provide our children.

We all know the story of some District of Columbia public schools: Low graduation rates, high dropout rates, low math and reading scores. And, we can all agree that the children in the District deserve a first class education.

A decade ago, I had the honor to Chair the District of Columbia Appropriations Sub-

committee. In that capacity, we worked to create a program to give a ‘hand-up’ to children in Washington, DC. We built a ‘three-sector’ approach: public schools, charter schools, and the latter, the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides parents with funds to send their children to private or parochial schools.

The bill before us today will reauthorize the three-sector approach to school reform in the District of Columbia—including the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program—through FY 2021.

The DC Opportunity Scholarship Program is a huge success. Last year alone 3,246 students submitted applications to participate in these scholarships and the program accepted 1,244 students.

88 percent of high school graduates in 2015, who were Opportunity Scholarship recipients, enrolled at a 2- or 4-year college.

Congress should listen to the voices of parents and students and continue to work to ensure that this not only survives, but grows.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following:

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER REID, SPEAKER RYAN, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As Mayor and members of the Council of the District of Columbia, we support the three-sector federal funding approach for DC’s K–12 education system that is authorized in the Scholarships for Opportunities and Results (SOAR) ACT. Our support for the SOAR Act is rooted in the importance we place on the much-needed federal funding for DC Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools which totaled \$30 million in FY2016. This funding is provided via our DC federal payments and does not take away from our state formula funding for education; rather, it adds to it. A reauthorization of the SOAR Act would help safeguard \$150 million in federal funds for DCPS and public charter schools over five years. These funds are critical to the gains that the District’s public education system has seen in recent years.

In addition, we are very concerned about a bill that was recently introduced in Congress, the Educational Freedom Accounts Act (H.R. 4426/S. 2455), which would require the District of Columbia to re-direct local funds from DCPS and the public charter schools toward Educational Savings Accounts for DC students who want to attend private schools. This bill would be harmful to the District’s progress on education and we strongly oppose it. SOAR Act reauthorization is far a better alternative and works for our families and school system.

SOAR Act funding for DCPS has been used to support initiatives that reward and increase retention of performing teachers and principals. The funds also help attract more high quality teachers and principals to DCPS and to improve the efficiency with which schools are run. After years of decline, DCPS enrollment is rising for the first time in decades. Schools that previously struggled to fill their prekindergarten seats have waiting lists and other schools are attracting families back into the system at grade levels that have historically lost students.

Public charter schools in the District represent 44 percent of the public school popu-

lation of more than 85,000 students with 62 public charter schools on 115 campuses. Since FY2004, federal funds authorized in the SOAR Act have supported the acquisition, renovation, modernization, and expansion of charter school facilities in the District. These funds have also been used to improve academic achievement, teacher and leader quality and recruitment, instructional support, and graduation pathways.

The SOAR Act provides equal amounts of federal funding for the DCPS, public charter schools and the OSP. We understand that these funding streams are inextricably linked. We urge you to ensure that the SOAR Reauthorization Act (S. 2171/H.R. 10) becomes law before the end of this Congress so that this critical funding for K–12 education in the District of Columbia is not put in jeopardy.

Sincerely,

Muriel Bowser, Mayor; LaRuby May, Councilmember; Brandon T. Todd, Councilmember; Mary Cheh, Councilmember; Phil Mendelson, Chairman; Vincent Orange, Councilmember; Anita Bonds, Councilmember; Yvette M. Alexander, Councilmember; Kenyon R. McDuffie, Councilmember.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 2016]
FOR D.C., PREAUTHORIZING SCHOOL CHOICE IS
THE RIGHT CHOICE

(By Editorial Board)

IN THEIR zeal to kill off the federally funded scholarship program for poor D.C. students, opponents have peddled the fiction that Congress foisted the program on an unwilling city. In fact, the program was backed enthusiastically by then-Mayor Anthony A. Williams (D) and a key D.C. Council member, and parent demand for scholarships far outstrips supply. So let’s hope that a letter from Mayor Muriel E. Bowser (D) and a majority of the council urging continued funding for the program finally puts the myth to rest and helps allow more students to benefit from the program.

The D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides needy students with vouchers to attend private schools of their choice, is up for reauthorization. As has happened before with all-too-depressing frequency since the scholarships were established in 2004, the program is under attack from unions and other opponents. If Congress fails to act, the city will also lose out on millions of dollars that go to its traditional and charter public schools as part of the three-sector federal funding deal.

The very real danger of the District losing \$150 million in federal funds over five years apparently finally sunk in with members of the council. Three members who previously had urged that the program be killed joined Ms. Bowser and five other members, including council Chairman Phil Mendelson (D), in a March 7 letter to congressional leaders in support of the Scholarships for Opportunities and Results (SOAR) Act. House Speaker PAUL D. RYAN (R-Wis.) in a statement called the support of the mayor and council “an important boost” in the effort to get reauthorization to the president’s desk.

We hope so. Mr. RYAN is right that “when we give more families a choice, more students succeed.” Uncertainty about the future of the program is the alleged reason the Education Department has, for several years, put a hold on funds that would allow additional students into the program. Officials with Serving Our Children, the nonprofit that took over administration of the scholarships in October, told us there are more than 1,900 applicants, with more expected, for just 146 new spots next year. If Congress doesn’t reauthorize the program, funding could dry

up, with no new students accepted after the 2016-2017 school year. The scholarships provide a lifeline to low-income and underserved families, giving them the school choice that more affluent families take as a given. And because the program results in more federal money for D.C. public education and not less—another myth advanced by opponents—it's time for Congress to act.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4901, as I did when the House debated a nearly identical measure last October.

We have been told that the purpose of this bill is to help all DC children get a better education.

I strongly support that objective, but this bill does not.

Let me be crystal clear: public funds should support public education.

But this bill proposes to spend 100 million dollars over five years to fund vouchers to send students in the District of Columbia to private schools.

Coming from the city of Baltimore, I understand the complexities of turning around struggling inner city schools.

Almost ten years ago, I became deeply involved in improving one of my own neighborhood schools, the Maritime Industries Academy.

It takes vision, commitment, accountability and, yes, resources to begin the process of turning troubled schools around.

However, it is extremely difficult to turn around public schools if we divert public resources to private schools.

By dividing funding among DC Public Schools, DC Charter Schools, and private school vouchers, this bill provides one-third of its total funding to voucher students, a tiny fraction of the District's students.

The lack of equity is stunning. Our focus should be on maximizing the impact of the federal government's limited resources to serve ALL of the District's students.

This program was last authorized in 2011, over my strong objection and along party lines, despite the fact that the study on the program's impacts mandated by law found that the use of vouchers had no effect on academic achievement, as measured by math and reading test scores.

Vouchers also had no impact on students' perceptions of school safety and satisfaction.

We have heard all the Republican rhetoric justifying massive cuts to education funding—all the talk about budget constraints, about tightening our belts, and about making sacrifices.

But apparently all that goes out the window when Republicans want to give 100 million dollars in taxpayer funds to private schools.

As a graduate of public schools and a long-time advocate of quality public education, I believe our highest priority must be to use limited taxpayer dollars to support programs that will truly meet the educational needs of all children.

This bill does not do that. So I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 4901.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4901, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization (SOAR) Act.

H.R. 4901 would reauthorize the District of Columbia's private school voucher program, the Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP), for five years through 2021.

Simply put, this bill diverts much needed resources from the D.C. public school system into this unsuccessful and counterproductive voucher program.

We know that this voucher program has failed to improve academic achievement, threatens vital civil rights for students, undermines constitutional protections, and is poorly managed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just another Republican attack on the District of Columbia's right to self-governance.

Even worse, the Districts' government did not request this reauthorization—nor did its representative, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

If the District wants to establish a voucher program, it has the authority to do so.

But it hasn't for many of the reasons I listed above.

Mr. Speaker, we should work to fully fund our public schools and ensure equal access to education for all students—not funnel additional funds into this ineffective and poorly managed program.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 706, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ted Lieu of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4901 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Insert after section 7 the following new section:

SEC. 8. NONDISCRIMINATION AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE ENTITY AND PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS.

Section 3008(a) (sec. 38-1853.08(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by inserting “actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity,” after “national origin.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment would simply change the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program so that it could not discriminate against students based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

Sadly, we know that LGBT kids are often victims of bullying and hate. According to a survey by the Human Rights Campaign, LGBT youth were twice as likely as their non-LGBT peers to report being verbally harassed and excluded.

Moreover, misguided anti-LGBT laws, such as those passed in North Carolina and Mississippi, continue to send a message that being LGBT is not okay, and that is wrong. As one of my Republican colleagues earlier today on the floor stated, God makes every child different. It is wrong to systematically discriminate against students because they are LGBT.

We need to send our kids a message that saying whom they love and the gender they identify with does not dictate their self-worth, and it certainly should not dictate whether or not they can get a voucher. I move that we begin to do this right now by passing my amendment to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. Being LGBTQ is not a medical condition that needs to be cured. It is instead a beautiful reflection of what it means to be a human being.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, we went through regular order in our committee. We had field hearings. We had a markup. The gentleman was free to offer an amendment in committee. That did not happen.

This is a school choice bill. This is a bill that gives parents the opportunity to make choices about where their students can attend, and this scholarship program has been a very valuable tool. I am opposed to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 167, nays 228, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—167

Adams	Garamendi	Napolitano
Aguilar	Graham	Neal
Ashford	Grayson	Norcross
Bass	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pallone
Becerra	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bera	Hahn	Pelosi
Beyer	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Peters
Blumenauer	Higgins	Peterson
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Honda	Pocan
F.	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Quigley
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capps	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kind	T.
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Schiff
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Lawrence	Scott, David
Cohen	Lee	Serrano
Connolly	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lewis	Sherman
Cooper	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Courtney	Lipinski	Sires
Crowley	Loebach	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowenthal	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	(NM)	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Dingell	Carolyn	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Vela
F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Edwards	McDermott	Visclosky
Ellison	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Esty	Meeks	Schultz
Foster	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Moulton	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Nadler	Yarmuth

NAYS—228

Abraham	Comstock	Gosar
Aderholt	Conaway	Gowdy
Allen	Cook	Granger
Amash	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Amodei	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Babin	Crenshaw	Griffith
Barletta	Culberson	Grothman
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Guinta
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Benishek	Denham	Hardy
Bilirakis	Dent	Harper
Bishop (MI)	DeSantis	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Black	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Blackburn	Dold	Hensarling
Blum	Donovan	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Brat	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Bridenstine	Emmer (MN)	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Hunter
Buck	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Bucshon	Flores	Hurt (VA)
Burgess	Forbes	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Fortenberry	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jolly
Chaffetz	Garrett	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Gibbs	Jordan
Coffman	Gibson	Joyce
Cole	Gohmert	Kelly (PA)
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	King (IA)

King (NY)	Nunes	Shimkus
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Shuster
Kline	Palazzo	Simpson
Knight	Palmer	Smith (MO)
LaHood	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
LaMalfa	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Lamborn	Perry	Stefanik
Lance	Pittenger	Stewart
Latta	Pitts	Stivers
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Long	Poliquin	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Tiberi
Love	Posey	Tipton
Lucas	Price, Tom	Trott
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Turner
Lummis	Reichert	Upton
Marchant	Renacci	Valadao
Marino	Ribble	Wagner
Massie	Rice (SC)	Walberg
McCarthy	Rigell	Walden
McCaul	Roby	Walker
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walorski
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
Rodgers	Rokita	Wenstrup
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
Meehan	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Ross	Wittman
Mica	Rothfus	Womack
Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Woodall
Moolenaar	Royce	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Russell	Yoho
Mullin	Salmon	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Sanford	Young (IA)
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Young (IN)
Neugebauer	Schweikert	Zeldin
Noem	Scott, Austin	Zinke
Nolan	Sensenbrenner	
Nugent	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—38

Brady (PA)	Fincher	Newhouse
Butterfield	Graves (MO)	Payne
Calvert	Gutiérrez	Reed
Carson (IN)	Hanna	Rush
Collins (NY)	Himes	Sanchez, Loretta
Costa	Issa	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Stutzman
Davis, Danny	Katko	Takai
DeFazio	Keating	Torres
Duckworth	Kelly (MS)	Tsongas
Engel	Labrador	Westmoreland
Farr	McArthur	Whitfield
Fattah	Miller (MI)	

□ 1044

Messrs. ROKITA, DUFFY, and TROTT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CAPUANO, JEFFRIES, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to vote was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 181, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

AYES—224

Abraham	Barletta	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barr	Black
Allen	Barton	Blackburn
Amash	Benishek	Blum
Amodei	Bilirakis	Boustany
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)

Brat	Bridenstine	Hudson	Pompeo
Brooks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Posey
Buchanan	Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Bucshon	Burgess	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Byrne	Hunter	Reed
Byrne	Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Carter (TX)	Chabot	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Chabot	Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)
Clawson (FL)	Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Rigell
Cole	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Collins (GA)	Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Comstock	Comstock	Jolly	Rogers (AL)
Conaway	Conaway	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Cook	Cook	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Cramer	Cramer	Joyce	Rokita
Crenshaw	Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Culberson	Culberson	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Curbelo (FL)	Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross
Delaney	Delaney	Kline	Rothfus
Denham	Denham	Knight	Rouzer
Dent	Dent	LaHood	Royce
DeSantis	DeSantis	LaMalfa	Russell
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Lamborn	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Lance	Sanford
Donovan	Donovan	Latta	Scalise
Duffy	Duffy	Lipinski	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Long	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Ellmers (NC)	Ellmers (NC)	Love	Sessions
Emmer (MN)	Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Shimkus
Farenthold	Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Fitzpatrick	Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Fleischmann	Fleischmann	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Fleming	Fleming	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Flores	Flores	Massie	Stefanik
Forbes	Forbes	McCarthy	Stewart
Fortenberry	Fortenberry	McCaul	Stivers
Fox	Fox	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Tiberi
Garrett	Garrett	McMorris	Tipton
Gibbs	Gibbs	Rodgers	Trott
Gibson	Gibson	McSally	Turner
Gohmert	Gohmert	Meadows	Upton
Goodlatte	Goodlatte	Meehan	Valadao
		Messer	Wagner
		Mica	Walberg
		Miller (FL)	Walden
		Miller (MI)	Walker
		Moolenaar	Walorski
		Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi
		Mullin	Weber (TX)
		Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
		Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
		Neugebauer	Westerman
		Noem	Whitfield
		Nugent	Williams
		Nunes	Wilson (SC)
		Olson	Wittman
		Palazzo	Womack
		Palmer	Woodall
		Paulsen	Yoder
		Pearce	Yoho
		Perry	Young (AK)
		Pittenger	Young (IA)
		Hice, Jody B.	Young (IN)
		Pitts	
		Poe (TX)	
		Poliquin	

NOES—181

Adams	Cicilline	Ellison
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Eshoo
Ashford	Clarke (NY)	Esty
Bass	Clay	Farr
Beatty	Cleaver	Foster
Becerra	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)
Bera	Cohen	Fudge
Beyer	Connolly	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Gallego
Blumenauer	Cooper	Garamendi
Bonamici	Costa	Graham
Bost	Costello (PA)	Grayson
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Green, Al
F.	Crowley	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Griffith
Brooks (AL)	Cummings	Grijalva
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Hastings
Bustos	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Butterfield	DelBene	Higgins
Capps	DeSaulnier	Himes
Capuano	Deutch	Hinojosa
Cárdenas	Dingell	Honda
Cárdenas	Doggett	Hoyer
Carney	Dold	Huffman
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Israel
Castor (FL)	F.	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Jeffries
Chu, Judy		

Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Schiff
Kaptur	Meng	Schrader
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott (VA)
Kennedy	Moulton	Scott, David
Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Kilmer	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kind	Napolitano	Sherman
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Simpson
Kuster	Nolan	Sinema
Langevin	Norcross	Sires
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lawrence	Pascarella	Speier
Lee	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Perlmutter	Takano
Lewis	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Pingree	Titus
Loebuck	Pocan	Tonko
Lofgren	Polis	Van Hollen
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lowey	Quigley	Veasey
Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Vela
(NM)	Reichert	Velázquez
Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
(NM)	Richmond	Walz
Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Maloney,	Ruiz	Schultz
Carolyn	Ruppersberger	
Maloney, Sean	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman
McCollum	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
McDermott	T.	Wilson (FL)
McGovern	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Calvert	Graves (MO)	Payne
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Sanchez, Loretta
Collins (NY)	Hanna	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Issa	Stutzman
Davis, Danny	Katko	Takai
DeFazio	Keating	Torres
Duckworth	Kelly (MS)	Tsongas
Engel	Labrador	Westmoreland
Fattah	MacArthur	
Fincher	Newhouse	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1051

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 2016, I was unable to vote on H.R. 4901, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act. I would have voted in support of final passage of H.R. 4901, rollcall No. 179, had I been present.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 179 on H.R. 4901, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote on H.R. 4901 in order to attend a family wedding. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 179 (H.R. 4901).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 178, Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4901, I would have voted "yes." On rollcall No. 179, Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act, H.R. 4901, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on April 29, 2016, due to a medical procedure. Had I been present, I would have voted: On

The Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4901, I would have voted "yea." On Passage of H.R. 4901, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Friday, April 29, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 178 and "nay" on rollcall vote 179.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 2016, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 178 and 179. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 178 and "no" on rollcall 179.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 2016, TO TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2016

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, May 3, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THE LIVES OF UGA STUDENTS LOST IN A TRAGIC ACCIDENT

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my friends and colleagues from the Georgia delegation and I rise in honor of the lives of four bright young University of Georgia students who were killed in a tragic car accident outside of Athens on Wednesday evening.

We pray for and grieve for the families of Christina, Halle, Kayla, and Brittany, and the entire University of Georgia community. We also pray for Agnes, who remains in critical condition, that she may be healed.

The remarkable impact of these women upon UGA's campus is evidenced by the thousands of students, faculty, and staff who gathered yesterday in an outpouring of love, support, and remembrance.

Mr. Speaker, this tragedy is every parent's worst nightmare, and our hearts ache for these families.

I ask all my colleagues and all of those watching to pray for these families and to join the Georgia delegation in a moment of silence for Christina, Halle, Kayla, and Brittany, as well as for Agnes, and to know, in the words of Psalm 147:3: "He heals the brokenhearted and binds their wounds."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will please rise and join in a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has ordered the bill H.R. 5077, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, reported favorably to the House today, and will file its report on the bill in the House in early May.

Mr. Speaker, the classified schedules of authorizations and the classified annexes accompanying the bill are available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in room HVC-304 of the Capitol Visitor Center. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration by the House.

I recommend that Members wishing to review the classified annex contact the committee's director of security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will ensure the availability of the appropriately cleared committee staff to assist Members who desire assistance during their review of these classified materials.

I urge interested Members to review these materials in order to better understand the committee's recommendations. The classified annexes to the committee's report contain the committee's recommendations on the intelligence budget for fiscal year 2017 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of House rule XXIII, which only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath provided for in the rules.

In addition, the committee's rules require that Members agree in writing to a nondisclosure agreement. The agreement indicates that the Member has been granted access to the classified annexes and that they are familiar with the rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of that information and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my constituent and friend, Dawn Williamson, in raising awareness for congenital diaphragmatic hernia, also known as CDH.

Mr. Speaker, CDH affects over 1,000 babies in the United States per year

and has affected more than 700,000 babies worldwide since the year 2000.

After giving birth to a child with CDH and finding no support groups for mothers of babies with CDH, my friend, Dawn, founded the Association of Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Research, Awareness, and Support, or CHERUBS, for short, in 1995.

Headquartered in the beautiful town of Wake Forest, North Carolina, CHERUBS is an international charity helping over 5,700 families in 61 countries.

Mr. Speaker, babies born with CDH and their loving families face a difficult journey, and I rise today to raise awareness and to recognize the importance of strong individuals like Dawn Williamson, who work to make the journey for others easier and more comfortable than it was for her.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to offer this resolution expressing support for the designation of April 2016 as National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month. This condition is far too common for us to know so little.

□ 1100

HONORING THE VICTORY EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am always reminded of the greatness of America. When the word came: Go west, go west. A little church, a little general store, and a school.

I am excited this morning to honor the Victory Early College High School in Acres Home, sponsored by the Aldine Independent School District. And I thank Dr. Bamberg, the superintendent; the trustees; and, as well, Dr. Phyllis Cormier, for they are celebrating right now the National Blue Ribbon Award ceremony—yes, a public school.

Victory Early College High School is one of two schools in Houston and one of 335 schools nationally to earn the distinction of a National Blue Ribbon School at an award ceremony hosted by the Department of Education. They exemplify overall academic excellence. Yes, inner-city children, poor children, are showing progress and closing achievement gaps among student subgroups. This particular school has been exemplary in both areas.

We are also celebrating Senior Signing Day because each of our graduating seniors will graduate under the distinguished high school plan, and all have been accepted to a 4-year university. They will announce their schools at this event—a public school.

The mayor will be there. I am in Washington. I wanted to pay tribute to them. And I want to thank Aldine for letting their M.O. Campbell Center be used for a shelter for those who are fleeing the flood.

PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY FOR VETERANS ACT

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Protection and Advocacy for Veterans Act. This bill will engage our protection and advocacy agencies to ensure veterans are receiving the mental health care and substance abuse treatment they deserve.

Increased demand from veterans returning from war, a national shortage of mental health professionals, and a prescription drug abuse epidemic have made it difficult for the VA to keep pace with the growing need in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, progress is being made, but I believe we can do better. I also believe that we owe it to our veterans to look beyond the traditional means and bring all available resources to bear in ensuring access to proper care for mental health and substance abuse treatment.

For 40 years, protection and advocacy agencies have monitored the quality of care in State-operated hospitals, psychiatric wards, and other facilities. They have the authority to inspect medical records, make recommendations to providers, and, when necessary, take legal action on behalf of patients. I believe bringing this high degree of patient advocacy expertise to the VA can greatly benefit our veterans.

NATIONAL INFERTILITY AWARENESS WEEK

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize April 24 to April 30 as National Infertility Awareness Week. Infertility is defined as the inability to conceive or carry a pregnancy to term after 12 months of trying to conceive.

The American Society for Reproductive Medicine, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the World Health Organization recognize infertility as a disease.

Today, one in eight couples have trouble getting pregnant or sustaining a pregnancy. Infertility affects approximately 10 percent of the population, but rarely are the necessary medical treatments covered by insurance. Alarmingly, this, too, is the case for veterans who have served our country and have become infertile as a result of their service.

This issue strikes diverse groups, affecting people from all socioeconomic levels and cuts across racial, ethnic, and religious lines.

We must acknowledge the medical and emotional aspects of infertility and continue to support efforts to make treatment more accessible to

help improve the quality of life for people with infertility.

This week, I ask that we all recognize and raise awareness on the issue of infertility as a disease and support the family-building efforts of those struggling with this disease of infertility.

TOP 50 BEST TOWNS FOR FAMILIES IN THE GARDEN STATE

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note a special distinction for several communities in New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District.

New Jersey Family magazine has named several towns in the congressional district I serve as being among the top 50 best towns for families in the Garden State.

Nearing the top of the list, at second place, is Montgomery Township in Somerset County. Joining Montgomery on the top 50 list are Bethlehem, Berkeley Heights, Branchburg, Chester Township, Clinton Township, Cranford, Hillsborough, Lebanon, Long Hill, New Providence, and West Amwell.

I know these communities, and my wife and I live in Clinton Township. Each has excellent public schools, a strong local spirit, and each is a great place to plant roots and raise a family.

I congratulate the local leadership in these municipalities, the elected officials and community leaders—nearly all of whom are volunteers—for the excellent management of these towns. Each is very deserving of this recognition.

RECOGNIZING JOHN L. SMITH OF THE LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the Las Vegas Review Journal, Nevada's largest newspaper, lost another standard bearer this week. John L. Smith, who resigned after citing difficulties with management, spent nearly three decades enlightening, emboldening, and entertaining the Las Vegas community.

In his resignation letter, John L. Smith said that he learned to never punch down in his weight class, an approach that is rare in journalism today.

He wrote: "You don't hit little people. You defend them."

Those principles, reflected in his columns that appeared four times a week, made him a beloved figure, a respected wordsmith, and a community leader.

It is no surprise that during the week when he resigned, he received the Ancil Payne Award for Ethics in Journalism. It wasn't the first time his work had been recognized, and I am sure it will not be the last.

PARK FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, A 2016 GREEN RIBBON SCHOOL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the administrators, staff, and students from the Park Forest Elementary School in State College, Pennsylvania, on being named a 2016 Green Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education.

Park Forest is 1 of only 47 schools across the entire Nation to earn this distinction, which is given to schools for their innovative efforts to reduce their environmental impact and reduce utility costs, improve health and wellness, and ensure sustainability practices.

In addition to the elementary school's efforts to reduce its energy use and waste footprint, it has also received grants to construct an outdoor compost bin and created a garden compost program. The school grounds also include vegetable, herb, pollinator, and rain gardens. In partnership with Penn State University, the school has also built a greenhouse which later served as the model for two built at a school in Rwanda.

This just scratches the surface of the initiatives undertaken at Park Forest Elementary, and everyone involved deserves praise for their efforts.

OPIOID ADDICTION

(Mr. RUPPERSBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge House leadership to take action against the scourge of opioid addiction that is plaguing our communities.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, drug overdoses now surpass car accidents as the leading cause of injury-related death for Americans between the ages of 25 and 65.

In Baltimore, opioid overdose has been declared a public health emergency. There are about 19,000 active heroin users in Baltimore City, and far more who abuse prescription opioids.

But this isn't just an urban issue. I have personally heard from families from all walks of life throughout my district that have been devastated by heroin and prescription drugs. No socioeconomic level is safe.

To this end, I urge leadership to move the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act forward. Among other measures, this important bipartisan bill will expand the availability of naloxone to law enforcement agencies and other first responders to help reverse overdoses, expand resources to identify and treat incarcerated individuals suffering from addiction, and ex-

pand disposal sites for unused prescription medications to keep them out of the hands of young people.

Only through a comprehensive approach can we stop and reverse current trends.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF CHIEF JUSTICE PERRY HOOPER, SR.

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and contributions of Chief Justice Perry Hooper, Sr., who passed away this past Sunday.

Justice Hooper was born in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1925. He served our Nation in the United States Marine Corps before attending the University of Alabama School of Law. He went on to be elected probate judge and later circuit judge in Montgomery County.

His groundbreaking election as chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court in 1994 marked the first time a Republican had served on the court since Reconstruction.

Justice Hooper brought dignity and grace to the Supreme Court, along with his consummate professionalism. He raised the court to a higher level. Whether you were a lawyer or a party, he treated you with respect and fairness.

Most importantly, Justice Hooper understood that judges don't make the law, but decide cases with wisdom and fairness. So on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District, I want to share my deepest sympathies with his wife, Marilyn, and four sons. Justice Hooper will never be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING SOPHIE MARIE EDWARDS

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sophie Marie Edwards, an incredible young woman who has made ending hunger her personal passion.

Realizing that some of her friends in elementary school didn't have enough to eat, Sophie founded Square Meal Project when she was only 8 years old. Since then, she has raised more than \$6,000 for food banks and local feeding programs. Through her efforts, more than 1,000 kids have been able to receive a healthy summer lunch. She has also made it her mission to educate everyone she meets about the problem of hunger in America.

Sophie's work in her hometown of Marietta, Georgia, led her to be recognized as a youth advocate for the national No Kid Hungry campaign.

I am inspired by Sophie's commitment, by her compassion, and by her drive to end hunger. Sophie teaches us all that you are never too young to

make a difference. I have no doubt that Sophie will continue to do great things to end hunger now.

AR KIDS READ

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible work being done in my home State of Arkansas by AR Kids Read.

When I was the chamber of commerce chair in Little Rock, I was proud to help AR Kids Read expand 3½ years ago with the goal of improving literacy rates among our children in Arkansas.

In the 2014–2015 school year alone, AR Kids Read was able to provide over 400 trained tutors to serve 1 hour a week in 47 different schools in central Arkansas.

This inspirational program helps nearly 1,000 students each year struggling to learn to master reading in the first through third grades. AR Kids Read has been recognized by one of the five model programs at the Reading is Fundamental—RIF—50th Anniversary Gala here in Washington, D.C.

I extend my congratulations and best wishes for much continued success to AR Kids Read and thank all of my fellow citizens who volunteer as tutors.

MARY ANN WASIL MEMORIAL TOAST

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and to celebrate the life of Mary Ann Wasil, one of my personal heroes and one of the strongest women I have ever known, who passed away earlier this month.

Mary Ann possessed a tenacious spirit, an unyielding faith, a heart full of love, and an infectious smile. She was one of a kind. She was a police officer, an actor, a development officer for her church and its elementary school, and the founder of a nonprofit organization, a health activist, and a mother to three incredible children.

Breast cancer was what took Mary Ann from us, but it is also what one of her lasting legacies was born from—a successful and much-needed breast health initiative, the Get in Touch Foundation. She was a vocal champion for the Affordable Care Act and access to high quality, affordable health care for all.

In 2010, Mary Ann won a contract from Balboa Press to publish her memoir, "A Diary of Healing: My Intense and Meaningful Life With Cancer." Throughout its pages, you can hear Mary Ann's laughter, you can feel her courage, and you will often find yourself crying with her, experiencing the twists and the turns of her journey.

My heart goes out to Betsy, to Mary, and to Eddy. Your mother was quite

simply an extraordinary human being, activist, author, mentor, friend, and mother. She lives on in our hearts forever.

□ 1115

CONGRATULATING CARSON WENTZ

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, forgive me for being proud, but today my 750,000 fellow North Dakotans and I are standing a little taller as we celebrate the extraordinary accomplishments of one exceptional young man.

Last night, every television in North Dakota was tuned in to the NFL draft to see who the lucky team would be who gets North Dakota State University quarterback Carson Wentz. The Philadelphia Eagles used the second overall pick to take Carson. Cheers and tears of pride and admiration for the most famous Bison football player ever expressed a sense of State patriotism.

NDSU's record of five consecutive FCS national championships took a backseat to one special Bismarck native, and rightfully so. Carson Wentz is more than a 6 foot, 5 inch superathlete. He is a man who takes God's incredible gifts and works them with an ethic of worship. His mind and heart are as big as his frame; and his pride is not in himself, but it is in his team, in his school, in his community, and in his State.

We are happy for the good people of Philadelphia, knowing that Pennsylvania is gaining much more than a great football player. They are gaining a great citizen. Congratulations, Eagles.

And God bless you in your new adventure, Carson Wentz. Thanks for being a great ambassador for North Dakota.

HONORING SERGIO KLOR DE ALVA

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Sergio Klor de Alva.

Sergio was a member of the Farr congressional team, and was taken from us in a tragic accident late Monday night. Sergio served as an intern in my office. He was engaging, kind, and ever helpful.

Upon leaving Washington, he returned to the University of California at Santa Cruz, and he won a place on the student council. He later volunteered his time to work in Congressman MIKE HONDA's reelection campaign. At 24, he had amassed a resume that spoke to the dedication and passion he had for civil service.

I was and continue to be impressed with this young man's incredible ambi-

tion. His future would have undoubtedly been one of public service.

Upon leaving my office, Sergio said in his exit interview:

I cannot tell the future, but I can see mine here. But until that day, know that I will miss this place.

Rest assured, Sergio, this place will miss you. God bless your short, but so meaning meaningful, life and your beautiful family who have to live in the tragedy of your death.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COUNTY CORNER

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a small town in Utah where I remember a Sinclair gas station that was situated where Route 39 intersects Route 134. It is a place where parents would stop to fill up their cars while taking their kids to school, and airmen would stop on the way to serve at Hill Air Force Base; where fathers would fill up the RV on the way to the family vacation, and I may have actually stopped to get a few Dr Pepper's as well. County Corner store is part of the Sinclair family, which is today celebrating their 100-year anniversary.

Today, there are 1,300 Sinclair-branded stations in 24 States. They operate the largest refinery in the Rocky Mountain West, they have their offices located in Utah, and they have 1,200 employees.

You may actually recognize the green dinosaur that is the logo. It is an apatosaurus, and its name is Dino. It debuted at the World's Fair in Chicago in 1933, has been a part of the Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade, and is actually an honorary member of the Museum of Natural History.

In an era where it is sometimes en vogue to condemn the gas-powered engine, we have to realize that people drive to work, families drive to church, schoolbuses drive kids back and forth, as well as the fact that firefighters rush to help businesses that are threatened. The Sinclair Oil Corporation has a hand in making all that possible.

Happy birthday.

HONORING SAMUEL "BILLY" KYLES

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Memphis and the United States lost a great clergyman and civil rights leader this past week in Reverend Samuel "Billy" Kyles.

Samuel "Billy" Kyles was born in Mississippi, moved to Chicago, but found his home and his purpose in Memphis, Tennessee, where he founded Monumental Baptist Church and served there for 55 years.

He was a courageous man who helped integrate the Memphis schools. One of his daughters was one of the 13 young children that integrated the schools. He got on a bus and refused to go to the back of the bus in 1964 with six others and helped integrate the buses in Memphis. His life was dedicated to civil rights, making Memphis better, and serving his church members.

He is well known and remembered for being at the Lorraine Motel on the day that Dr. King was assassinated on April 4, 1968. On that occasion, he was near Dr. King and was a witness to the assassination, which he told people about throughout the country and is part of a documentary film called "The Witness."

He remembered Dr. King's work to all, witnessed what he did and what happened in Memphis. He lived his life as Dr. King would have wanted: trying to move civil rights forward and making America the country that it was supposed to be. A life well lived.

DEFUND NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

(Mr. BABIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration's foolish nuclear deal with Iran continues to get more troubling and damaging by the day.

Last week, we found out that the administration was spending \$8.6 million of our hard-earned tax dollars to buy nuclear material from Iran. That is right: the United States Government is borrowing money from China and the rest of the world to buy heavy water from Iran, water used in nuclear reactors.

This is insanely foolish. I thought that the goal of Obama's nuclear deal was to stop Iran's nuclear program, not subsidize it.

Iran remains the world's leading sponsor of terrorism. They have been directly tied to the deaths of thousands of U.S. servicemembers. Providing the Iranian regime with millions of tax dollars only gives them new financing to spread hateful ideology, terror, and death across the globe.

The Obama administration's payments to this terrorist regime further legitimize their growing nuclear ambitions. Is it any wonder that our allies no longer consider the United States a reliable partner?

Appeasement only emboldens bullies, terrorists, and dictators. Sadly, this is the path that this current administration has chosen.

VERIFYING OPTIMAL TOOLS FOR ELECTIONS ACT OF 2016

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is a grave threat that is facing the American electoral process in

2016, and that is the soundness and the dependability of our voting machines and the integrity of our voting process.

Nationwide, authorities are tabulating crucial voting results using faulty, out-of-date electronic voting machines from the era that predated the smartphone. These outdated machines are prone to crashes and screen freezes that can cause unacceptably long wait times. Additionally, old voting machines remain vulnerable to being hacked and elections can be stolen.

My bill, the Verifying Optimal Tools for Elections Act of 2016, otherwise known as the VOTE Act, would allocate millions of dollars to assist States in replacing these aging voting machine dinosaurs. The VOTE Act would also allocate millions of dollars in grants to assist in developing new technologies to assure accuracy in the voting process, to protect voting machine source codes from being hacked, and to train election officials.

The aim of the VOTE Act is simple: the safeguarding of elections by ensuring the very integrity of the voting process, while protecting access to the ballot box.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), as amended, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individual on the part of the House to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for a term expiring on December 31, 2017:

Mr. Daniel M. Slane, Ohio

HONORING BRAZOS VALLEY JEFFERSON AWARD RECIPIENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Harper Cunningham, age 12, and Maggie Cunningham, age 10, from College Station, Texas, who are recipients of the 2016 Jefferson Award for the Brazos Valley.

The Jefferson Awards are presented annually to honor our unsung heroes, ordinary citizens who have done something extraordinary and that will have a lasting impact on the community. It is fitting that the Jefferson Award be presented to these two young girls, who not only exemplify what it means to serve, but who also share Thomas Jefferson's passion for reading.

Harper and Maggie Cunningham's passion for reading and for helping

those in need led them to create an organization to promote literacy and the well-being of our community students. Their Books and a Blanket program provides a basket of books and a blanket to elementary schoolchildren in need across the Brazos Valley during the winter months.

Their mission is simple and impactful: they want all students to have access to books so that they, too, can experience the joy that comes from reading. Since 2012, Books and a Blanket has given away over 1,200 blankets and distributed over 33,000 books to over 2,500 children in need.

Mr. Speaker, these two young girls have done a tremendous job helping others, promoting literacy, and being inspiring leaders in our community. As President Ronald Reagan once said:

The greatest leaders are not necessarily the ones who do the greatest things. The greatest leaders are the ones who get other people to do the greatest things.

It is evident that Harper and Maggie are models of true leadership, and their desire to serve and empower others is inspiring. Young Americans like Harper and Maggie provide confidence for all of us about the future of our great country.

I congratulate Harper and Maggie Cunningham for their hard work, selfless service, and for being awarded the 2016 Jefferson Award for the Brazos Valley. Gina and I look forward to hosting them in Washington later this year for the National Jefferson Awards ceremony.

I would also like to congratulate the other 2016 Jefferson Award winners from the Brazos Valley: Stephanie Sale, Alma Villarreal, and David Ruesink. Their selfless service to our community is inspiring and also worthy of these special recognitions. I am humbled to represent all of them in Congress.

As I close, I ask all Americans to continue to pray for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICA'S TO-DO LIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we all got elected. I have been here 5 years now. You are fairly new to this institution. Everybody comes with a dream. You don't come because you are looking for new business cards. You come because you want to make a difference for folks back home. We all have about 700,000 bosses back home, and they want us to make a difference. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about some of those differences today.

You can't see it from where you are sitting, but I have got a little America's to-do list down here. I didn't have enough paper back in the office to do the entire to-do list. There is a lot out there, as I know you hear every weekend when you go home as well, but I put a couple of the top things out there.

□ 1130

I have "fix our roads and bridges" out there—just a terrible infrastructure issue. What separates America in terms of getting our goods to market around the globe is a world-class infrastructure. Investment in that infrastructure has waned in recent years as we have dangerous bridges and we have roads that are in desperate need of repair. That is one of those things—to maintain the postal roads—that the Constitution uniquely assigns to the United States Congress. That is on the to-do list.

Update our national WRRDA policy, Mr. Speaker. We are going to have wars on this planet—mark my words—not over oil, but over fresh water. Having a freshwater infrastructure, maintaining our natural resources, taking care of and being good stewards of those resources that we have been entrusted with are critically important. It is one of those things that the Federal Government has a dominant role in doing. We have to get on that.

Tax relief, Mr. Speaker. Where is that family back home who isn't trying to figure out how next month works and the month after that and the month after that?

I keep hearing about this economic recovery, and yes, the numbers are getting better slowly, but they are not improving nearly fast enough. The folks cannot afford to support an inefficient Federal Government. Tax relief is on that list.

Medicare, Mr. Speaker. There is not a man or a woman in this Nation who depends on Medicare who does not know it is in fiscal peril. There is not enough money in the Medicare trust fund to meet the promises that we have made to America's seniors. There is not enough money in the Medicare trust fund even though working age men and women begin paying in on their very first paychecks to meet the promises of this generation and the next. We owe America better than that. Fixing that is on the to-do list.

Improving veterans' care, Mr. Speaker. For Pete's sake, talk about something that is uniquely this government's responsibility. We ask so much of the young men and women in uniform who serve and protect this Nation, and they ask nothing of us. We make promises to them, and we must keep those promises. It is hard to open up the newspaper and not read a story of America's failing its veterans. We must do better, and we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, cutting spending. For Pete's sake, when folks back home do send a dollar's worth of taxes to Washington, D.C., they don't believe they

are going to get a dollar's worth of value out of it. They think it is going to get thrown down some rat hole somewhere, on some pet project that is not going to benefit anyone. They think it is going to get wasted on a regulatory infrastructure that isn't modernized for the 21st century. Every family has to do more with less in tough economic times, and the Federal Government is no different. This is just the beginning of the to-do list, Mr. Speaker.

It is dreary outside. There is a steady mist coming down. I haven't seen the Sun out there for days. Sometimes I get back home, and I hear that same kind of spirit coming from folks who are trying to feed and provide for their families. There is a dreariness out there, Mr. Speaker, such that folks feel like self-governance is not serving them in the way that it should. That is why you and I ran for Congress and that is why I have come to the House floor today with good news.

It is true that when you open up the newspaper, it is failure after failure after failure, but that is not telling the story of the work that the good men and women of this Chamber are doing, that Republicans and Democrats are coming together to do, that the House and the Senate are coming together to do, that the Congress and the White House are coming together to do. In this election season of everybody's talking about what divides us, of everybody's talking about what the failures are, I want to talk about those things that unite us and on which we are succeeding for the American people together.

Mr. Speaker, there have been 36 short-term transportation extensions since the last time we passed a long-term transportation bill. Thirty-six short-term extensions. If anybody is in the construction business, Mr. Speaker, they know you can't plan to build a bridge in a matter of days. This is a multiyear project. You need long-term planning and you long-term certainty.

Historically, that is what the Congress has provided: Republicans and Democrats coming together in a bipartisan way and Congress and the White House coming together to provide for a multiyear transportation bill. But it has been more than two decades, Mr. Speaker, since this body has passed a 5-year transportation bill—a multiyear transportation bill—that provides certainty to folks back home and that fulfills the commitment that every American citizen expects from the Federal Government in having collected gas taxes on every gallon of gas that the American consumer buys.

We all know about the infrastructure needs in this country. For more than two decades, Congress and the White House had not been successful in fulfilling that responsibility. When Republicans ran the show, we failed. When Democrats ran the show, we failed. When Republicans were in the White House, we failed. When Demo-

crats were in the White House, we failed. But this Congress—the men and women gathered here with this President in the White House—came together, and we succeeded with the first long-term transportation bill in more than 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years of funding is just the beginning. I won't tell you this is the end of the show. Our Transportation and Infrastructure chairman, BILL SHUSTER of Pennsylvania, wants to do more. This isn't the end. This is the beginning. It is a fantastic beginning, and it is one that we ought to celebrate of \$305 billion going back to communities around this Nation to focus on safety and infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it streamlines the process—the most dramatic streamlining of the regulatory process. It often takes longer to get regulatory approval to build a bridge than it does to build the bridge itself—years wasted on approval processes that could have been streamlined while we are still being good stewards of our environmental resources. This bill does that. It also eliminates the increase in costs that come with those delays, Mr. Speaker, the increase in costs that come from that bureaucracy so as to make sure the American taxpayer is getting more value for his dollar.

Mr. Speaker, it shores up the highway trust fund, and we will talk a lot about trust funds in this time today. The highway trust fund was going bankrupt. The highway trust fund didn't have enough money to meet the needs of the American highways, so \$70 billion has been transferred into that trust fund to make sure that we are keeping the promises that we have made to America.

Mr. Speaker, it has been two decades since America has had this kind of transportation success. We did that together. Open up the newspaper and see the divides and see the failures, but know that this is a success that we had together.

Mr. Speaker, I had water resources on America's to-do list. It had been 6 years since we had passed water resources legislation in this body, not in 2008 when Republicans controlled the White House, not in 2009 when Democrats controlled everything, not in 2010 when Democrats controlled everything, and not in '11 or '12 or '13, but we have come together, and we have gotten that done. It is not easy. It is hard. It doesn't happen quickly. It happens slowly and deliberatively. It has been 6 years since we have been able to succeed together in passing what we call the WRRDA bill, Mr. Speaker. Now it is done. Now it is the law of the land.

I want to make that clear, Mr. Speaker. I am not talking about bills today that the House has passed and are going nowhere. I am not talking about bills today that the House has passed and the Senate has passed but that are going nowhere. I am talking about bills today on which the House has worked entirely through the proc-

ess, on which the Senate has worked entirely through the process, and those which the President of the United States has signed into law—bills that are laws and are making differences for America's families.

This WRRDA bill, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, is the most comprehensive policy reform bill, again, in two decades, Mr. Speaker. It accelerates project delivery because, again, there is no more urgent need—as we see in Flint, Michigan—than having a stable and safe water infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it goes into \$18 billion worth of projects—projects that have been on the books for years but have failed, projects that folks have not committed the time and resources to complete—and it pulls those back in. It cancels all of those projects, saves that money, and rededicates it to projects that the American people can benefit from; and it strengthens the oversight and accountability because these are American taxpayer dollars we are talking about here. When they go out the door to localities back home, folks deserve to know they are being used responsibly. It is an increase in oversight and accountability. Again, it has been more than two decades since we have seen something of this kind. We got it done together—Republicans, Democrats, House, Senate, and White House.

Mr. Speaker, tax relief is on the list for American families, and tax relief was delivered by this body—this Congress—and this White House. Mr. Speaker, what Republicans failed to be able to do—and I am not knocking them. It was a difficult environment. I am a hardcore Republican from the great State of Georgia, but when George Bush was in the White House and when Republicans were running the House and when Republicans were running the Senate, they provided tax relief, but they couldn't make it permanent. They didn't have the votes to make it permanent, so it languished out there—families uncertain about what the tax future would hold, businesses uncertain about what the tax future would hold. Together, in this body, with the President's signature, we provided 99 percent of Americans the certainty that even George Bush and a Republican House and Senate could not do.

Divided government is hard, Mr. Speaker. Divided government is hard. The differences that we have on policy are dramatic, but there is still more that unites us as a Nation than divides us as a Nation. That is true in this Chamber as well, so we came together on tax policy and did that. Taxes were going to go up, Mr. Speaker. In this tough economy, taxes were going to go up on almost every family in the land. We prevented that income tax increase from hitting 99 percent of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to prevent the tax increase on 100 percent of Americans, but I couldn't get the votes to get

that done, and I know you would have joined me in that. Sometimes you have a choice between can you get something done or will you get nothing done. Mr. Speaker, I promise you, if you are working hard in trying to provide for your family back home, you do not care who is to blame for a problem; you just want the problem fixed. We could have stood around this Chamber and we could have argued amongst ourselves about whether the perfect is the enemy of the good. We did not. We struggled to find agreement, and we found that agreement, and we made a difference for 99 percent of Americans in the struggling economy to date. That counts, Mr. Speaker.

We talk about the to-do list as to the Medicare trust fund. Mr. Speaker, back in the late 1990s, when Newt Gingrich was the Speaker of the House and when Bill Clinton was the President, they made an effort to protect the Medicare trust fund from going bankrupt. This is something that has been on the minds of Americans all the way back to 1965. The Medicare trust fund has never been properly funded. Healthcare costs have always had a rate of inflation that has been higher than that of other services, and we have struggled with how to make the math work. They came up with a plan back in 1997 to fix it. The plan didn't work, and it was going to cause a dramatic reduction in what doctors were reimbursed and a dramatic reduction in the benefits that were available to senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, so what happened in 2003, when it came time for those first painful cuts to go into place, the first effort to protect the Medicare trust fund?

Congress kicked the can down the road. They delayed those cuts from going into place for 1 year.

What happened the next year?

They delayed it for a year again. The next year, they delayed it again. Then the next year, again and again and again and again—17 times, Mr. Speaker. We had come together and passed legislation that was designed to protect the Medicare trust fund, and when it came time to actually do the heavy lifting, we kicked that can down the road, all the while having the trust fund becoming more and more and more unstable. We all knew there was a problem, but nobody wanted to take the responsibility of fixing it.

Mr. Speaker, in this divided Congress, in this divided government, in this Washington that supposedly can't come together to fix American problems, we passed H.R. 2. It was the first bill out of the gate. Well, it was the second bill out of the gate, but it came right out in front. H.R. 2 was the first Medicare reform proposal to be signed into law in more than 10 years, and it solved a problem that had been created almost 20 years ago but that no Congress before or no President before had had the courage to permanently fix.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about Medicare as one of the third rails of politics—

don't touch that rail, or else you will be defeated. This body is not about who wins and who gets defeated. This body is about who can make a difference. We needed to make a difference for folks who were relying on Medicare. There were 392 House Members and 92 Senators who supported this bill. We hadn't been able to fix it for almost 20 years. We hadn't been able to fix it, so the can had been kicked down the road 17 times.

We came together, grappled with it, struggled with it, but ultimately came up with a proposal that almost all of the House and almost all of the Senate could support. They called it the sustainable growth rate, the SGR, that eliminated this failing piece of Medicare policy, that bent the long-term cost curve of Medicare, extending the life of the trust fund. In fact, it cuts the actuarial deficit in Medicare by almost 10 percent.

□ 1145

This is heavy lifting, Mr. Speaker, that Congress has punted on and punted on and punted on. With the leadership we have here today, with the collaboration that we have here today, not only did we pass it, not only did the Senate pass it, but we were able to pass it into law.

There are many parts of Medicare, Mr. Speaker. There is part A, part B, part C, part D. \$2.4 trillion, Mr. Speaker, is the way we bent the cost curve on those various components of Medicare in order to protect and ensure Americans for another generation that Medicare would be there for them.

Veterans: Mr. Speaker, again, you cannot open up the newspaper today without seeing the way that the system is failing our veterans. There is nothing that brings us together more in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, than standing up for those who have stood up for us.

We did that in the Veteran Access, Choice, and Accountability Act, Mr. Speaker. It was the largest overhaul of veterans health care, again, in more than a decade.

When Republicans ran the whole show, we couldn't get it done. When Democrats ran the whole show, they couldn't get it done. When we are divided, but focused, on crisis in this country, we have come together and we have gotten it done for the first time, Mr. Speaker.

For the first time in the history of veterans health care, we have said: If the veterans healthcare system is failing you, but you, as a serviceman or -woman, did not fail us, we are going to give you a process to get outside of that veterans system. We are going to give you a chance to go see your own doctor. We are going to give you a chance to go see any specialist you need. We are going to give you a chance to get the care that we promised you, but that the bureaucratic healthcare system has failed to deliver.

Mr. Speaker, in all of these many years of budget cutting that we have

talked about—trying to clamp down on spending, trying to make sure that all taxpayer dollars are being accounted for—so many accounts are going down, but veterans spending is going up.

Why? Because budgeting is about prioritizing. And when we come together not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans, we prioritize those who have served us.

It is the biggest change in health care for veterans in over a decade, Mr. Speaker, and folks are finally able to get the health care that they need. That is not it. There is more.

There is still a system in place that is failing veterans, Mr. Speaker. We couldn't come together on reforming the entire Veterans Administration. But we did come together on saying that: If you work at the Veterans Administration and you are failing our veterans, there is no place for you on the Federal payroll.

You know how hard it is to get rid of failing Federal employees, Mr. Speaker. We came together in a bipartisan way to say: If you are in the upper echelons of the VA, we are asking more of you. If you are in charge of serving our veterans, we are asking more of you. If you fail, we are going to ask you to leave so we can get somebody else in there.

We streamlined the firing process, Mr. Speaker, to get rid of ineffective employees as we had not done before in Federal employment.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk budgets. You know ending budget deficits is one of America's priorities. You know getting out of the businesses of mortgaging our children's future is one of America's priorities.

From 1966 to 2009, Mr. Speaker—and I chose that time because that was the beginning of Medicare and Medicaid, which are two of the largest spending programs on the ledger today. They are two that have ballooned much larger than their authors ever suggested that they would. This is when we got into some really difficult entitlement spending decisions.

From 1966 to 2009, that 43-year period, the debt in this country went up by 55 percent relative to GDP. It is still these mandatory spending programs that are driving our debt, but over a 43-year period our debt went up 55 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in the first 3 years of the Obama administration, our debt went up another 34. For 43 years, it had gone up 55 percent, way too much, but a gradual increase. In 3 years, it went up 35 percent. We went from going up about 1 percent a year to going up 10 percent a year, Mr. Speaker.

Today, with this Congress, this House, this Senate, divided government, from 2012 to 2015, when we have been grappling with this issue together, when we have been looking for answers together, when no side had complete control, but we had to work together to find solutions, we have collapsed that increase back down to that

1 percent a year. There is so much more to do, but we just disagree.

The President introduces a budget every year. That budget never balances, not this year, not next year, not 10 years from now, not 100 years from now. The President has different investment priorities than I do.

I serve on the Budget Committee. We do a budget every year. It always balances. So I have budgets that balance and budgets that never come to balance. Clearly, that is a big gap to bridge.

We have begun to bridge it, Mr. Speaker, collapsing the dramatic increase in the debt to levels that are still too high, but don't threaten our security as years past have. But no one ever believed we would be able to come together to do that. No one ever believed we could work with the President to get that done, and, yet, we have.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of that comes from the Budget Control Act. One of the best votes I have taken in this institution was the vote for the Budget Control Act. It was the largest reduction in Federal spending in the history of the republic. Hear that, Mr. Speaker.

In divided government—in fact, there was a Republican House, Democratic Senate, Democratic President, dramatically divided government. Power of the filibuster in the Senate. Hard to get anything done. We came together because America needed us to, to reduce spending in the most dramatic way in the history of the republic. It is not because somebody had all the votes and they jammed it through, but because we worked together to find a policy that made sense.

Mr. Speaker, people always think, when you talk about big budget and deficit reductions, that you are talking about some sort of phony Washington, D.C., math. You have seen the examples where you raise spending by \$5 instead of \$10 and then you call that a cut. We have all seen that math. Nonsense.

When I talk about budgets, I am talking about real numbers. I am talking about money going out the door. I am talking, even though we have 10,000 men and women a day qualifying for Social Security and Medicare, 10,000 new applicants every day for Social Security and Medicare, working together, we reduced the total amount of money going out the door not just for 1 year, but for 2 years. That is not funny Washington, D.C., math, Mr. Speaker. Those are real numbers, real dollars, going out the door.

We bent the curve together. Some of my colleagues might say we did too much. I would say we haven't done nearly enough, but we came together and we made a difference for deficits.

Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest differences we can make for deficits is putting folks back to work. It turns out you can't pay taxes if you don't have a job. You have to have money coming in the door in order to be part

of the system. So we focused together on creating American jobs. We focused together on putting families back to work. Again, this is something that unites us. It does not divide us.

We have done it in the spirit of trade, Mr. Speaker. We have done it in the spirit of manufacturing. We have passed legislation here that the President signed into law that is working today to make sure, if you work in a manufacturing industry in America, you are not disadvantaged relative to foreign competition.

If we are trying to export the best products made in the world today, those manufactured by American hands, we are tearing down the trade barriers that are preventing those products from getting into the hands of customers who want them overseas. We have done that together.

When it comes to tearing down those trade barriers, Mr. Speaker, America is already virtually a free trade zone. We always say we will play fair with other nations, but other nations don't always say that to us.

So this Congress empowered the President to go out and do those negotiations, to tear down those barriers, to make sure that American working families always get a fair shake on the global scene. Mr. Speaker, we haven't seen that happen in a decade.

A Republican Congress came together to work with a Democratic President to say we are all in this boat together. Putting families back to work is not a Republican priority alone, though it is a Republican priority. It is not a Democratic priority alone, though it is a Democratic priority. It is an American priority. That is why America's House and America's Congress and America's President work on it together.

Mr. Speaker, that takes me back to where I started. I will put America's to-do list up here on the board. I talked about the dreary weather outside and kind of the dreary spirit that I feel sometimes when I talk to folks about how Congress is operating and how Congress and the President are working together and how America, in the spirit of self-governance, is succeeding or failing at addressing America's priorities.

Mr. Speaker, we did the first roads and bridges bill, \$305 billion, in more than two decades. It is more long-term certainty than America had seen in 20 years because it was the right thing to do.

We updated the national water policy, Mr. Speaker. We have done more—it was the most substantial, positive improvement to delivering clean water to American citizens than we have seen in more than a decade. We did that together.

Tax relief: Mr. Speaker, working together, we prevented taxes from going up on 99 percent of American families. Working together, we did things that George Bush and a Republican Congress couldn't do because they didn't

have the votes 15 years ago. We did that together because it was the right thing to do in this tough economy.

Mr. Speaker, we came together on Medicare reform. There were 17 short-term extensions, kicking the can down the road, Congress and the President afraid to take a stand and solve a problem. We came together and did that, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, President Obama and America's Congress.

Improving veterans health care: Mr. Speaker, for the first time in American history, if the veterans healthcare system is failing you, we give you an exit ramp to go and see your physician, your specialist, the best that America has to offer, because, as a serviceman or -woman, we have made promises to you and, in a bipartisan, bicameral way, we are committed to keeping those promises. It is the biggest reforms in more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have cut spending. We have cut spending not with phony Washington, D.C., math, but with real dollars going out the door. The biggest deficit-reduction package in American history we did together, a divided government, divided Congress. But it is the right thing to do for the American people, and that is what this Congress is about.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the beginning of the to-do list. I don't want to feel like I am tooting the horn of bipartisanship in this institution. I didn't even have education reform on that list. I didn't have education reform on that list. But we have done it.

We have come together in a bipartisan way, bicameral, with the White House, signed into law the biggest evolution of education policy that we have seen in 10 years. Again, it has been more than a decade since we have come together to make sure that principals, teachers, and parents have more control over the education of children in our communities.

We repealed 49 different programs, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying hardcore conservative Republicans repealed them. I am not saying liberal Democrats repealed them. I am saying together we scoured the entire Federal education landscape looking for ways to do better for our families back home.

When we rolled up our sleeves, when we took off the Republican and Democratic labels, when we all sat down as parents and grandparents and community leaders about how to do better for our children, we found 49 programs, all of which had a constituency out there, all of which had somebody making a buck off of them, but they were programs that were failing our children and we ended them. We ended them together because it was the right thing to do. It is the biggest education reforms, Mr. Speaker, again, in more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have the time to go through the difference that we are making together. From our veterans,

H.R. 91, H.R. 203, H.R. 313, H.R. 2499, on and on and on, not bills that we have passed here in the House, though we have, but bills we have passed in the House, bills that have been passed in the Senate, bills that the House and Senate have come together on, bills that have been sent to the President's desk, and bills that the President has signed into law, making a difference.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, reducing the size and scope of government. H.R. 1626, H.R. 2029, H.R. 2048, and the list goes on and on and on. Doing things together for our bosses back home because they are going to make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, creating jobs and expanding economic opportunity. Again, H.R. 2029, H.R. 22, H.R. 1000, S. 535. Mr. Speaker, yes, there are even some bills that originated in the Senate that are delivering for the American people. I am proud to say most of them start with H.R., but there are even a few Senate bills in there. Good ideas from the other body that we took on, that we made better, that we sent to the President's desk, that he signed.

Defending America's freedom and security, patient-centered healthcare solutions. Mr. Speaker, everybody talks about the President's healthcare bill. You are either for it or you are against it. It is a divisive issue. Nobody talks about the fact that there are parts of the President's healthcare bill that I believe are broken from the hard core right and that my friends on the left believe are broken, too. And so we have come together not once, not twice, not three times, not five times, but almost a dozen times to repeal parts of the President's healthcare bill that we all agreed were not serving the American people.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, it is not about who can be a good Republican or who can be a good Democrat. It is about who can be a good public servant, and that is never going to make the front page of the newspaper. It is never going to be a part of this Presidential election cycle. It is never going to be in a commercial on TV talking about how successful we are when the cameras go off, when the labels come off, and when we are focused on what we all came here to do, and that is to make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep going on through this election cycle. There is going to be more division, there is going to be more strife, and there is going to be more finding out who is to blame and whose fault it is.

I have gotten to know the men and women in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I confess, there were some of them that I wanted to dislike from the get-go. Oh, I wanted to dislike them. I had seen them on TV, and I knew they didn't have any merit, didn't have any business being here, didn't have any desire to serve the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my confession here today is I was wrong. I was wrong.

There are colleagues on the other side of the aisle with whom I disagree with about virtually everything, but for that one small issue on which we find some common ground, they will roll up their sleeves and they will bleed with me and sweat with me until we find a way to make a difference for families back home in their district and mine.

Mr. Speaker, there are folks on the other side who come down here on this floor and rail and rail and rail, and it is every partisan tagline that you could imagine, but when the camera goes off, they roll up their sleeves and they get to work on making a difference for their district and for mine.

Mr. Speaker, my voice is not loud enough to drown out all the division that is in a Presidential election campaign. Mr. Speaker, my voice is not loud enough to drown out all the commercials going on all over the country and all the headlines all over the country that talk about how Washington is a big cesspool, and it is broken, and we should just give up on self-governance altogether, but not me. My voice may not be loud enough, but it will be tireless.

I believe in self-governance. I believe that my district has priorities that are going to be different from priorities in another district, and that is okay. I believe that division sometimes brings out the best of ideas, and that is okay. I believe that my colleagues believe that there is no challenge too big for America to confront when Americans confront it together.

I do not know what November holds, but I know this: We have the best system of governance on the planet. It is not easy. It is not clean. It is not simple. But when you put the American people in charge, it is effective.

Mr. Speaker, you are not going to sell good newspapers talking about the difference that we make together in self-governance, but we are going to make that difference together. Folks here didn't come for the headlines. They came to do the things that mattered, and I am proud to work with folks on both sides of the aisle to get that done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2908. An act to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1635. An act to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes.

S. 1875. An act to support enhanced accountability for United States assistance to Afghanistan, and for other purposes.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

IMPORTANT ISSUES IN THE NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my good friend—and I think it is important that we note that our colleagues are good friends and Americans who care. That is why I have come to the floor to challenge the hearts and minds of my colleagues, for my discussion today, as the gentleman that preceded me, will be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues to peruse and for the American people to peruse.

I do take note of the fact, as the gentleman recounted the history of budgets—and I might say that I, too, spent time working on the 1997 budget. I have been privileged to serve from that time when a bipartisan effort—with everyone, in essence, putting down their obstructionist perspectives—generated one of the best health insurance programs for our children, called CHIP, that the Nation has seen, that millions of American children are now insured.

But it is important to note that the present Republican majority failed to put a budget on the floor for us to vote up or down, primarily because there were Members in their own conference that would not vote because the cuts were not sufficient, even though trillions of dollars were cut from education and many other services that the American people need.

Now, I know that the American people are very independent. There are States that have worked very hard to ensure that their particular citizens in their State are well taken care of, but the one thing I know about the Federal Government, it is the umbrella on a rainy day.

I will go home to my district, having suffered the terrible impact of major flooding, 20 inches of rain devastating young families, devastating people who flooded just less than a year ago in May of 2015. Oh, we pulled ourselves up by our bootstraps, tore out carpet, threw out all of our personal possessions, but we needed the umbrella, FEMA, that is en route to my district now to help those who cannot help themselves or those who had never flooded in 50 years. So we cannot discount the role of the Federal Government.

The United States military is the finest in the world. The Affordable Care Act, yes, needs to be fixed in certain areas, but 20 million Americans have gotten insurance, and more Americans have private insurance because they said, you know what, it is the right thing to do.

So it troubles me when we talk about a budget that should have been put on the floor that was a combination of the efforts of Democrats and Republicans, and when we listen to the President and work together, but no budget has come because they realize the draconian budget that is slashing government, throwing people out in the streets is not a budget that America can even tolerate. They could not overcome those that didn't even want that budget. They wanted to cut and slice education, resources to our military, health care, and the environment even more.

So I stand in the backdrop of that challenge to challenge this Congress again. I was one of the first Members of Congress to deal with raising the need for serious attention to the Ebola virus as it hit Texas in Dallas. The first American to be diagnosed was in our State of Texas.

I began as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security to ask what our airports were doing, how are we assessing those who are traveling into our country, and making sure that the Centers for Disease Control were at my airports, both in Dallas and in Houston, Texas.

Now 1 year later or a couple of years later, we are now facing this issue called the Zika virus. I want to be very clear, we are not paying the attention to this that we should.

A headline reads: "Scariest Than We Initially Thought." The CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, sounds a major alarm, a warning regarding the Zika virus. "Public health officials used their strongest language to date in warning about a Zika outbreak in the United States, as the Obama administration lobbied Congress for \$1.9 billion to combat the mosquito-borne virus."

What did I start out by saying?

The Federal Government should not run our lives, but it is the umbrella on a rainy day. It is the only entity that can muster the stakes and resources to deal with what the CDC has said is a far more serious issue.

If we look at Puerto Rico, they are the eye of the storm. Texas, the eye of the storm. Florida, the eye of the storm. It is important to note that we have not done what we should be doing.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, which has a core mission of emergency preparedness of State and local governments to be equipped to react to emergencies, I am acutely aware of the potential for the Zika virus to be a real challenge for State and local governments in the coming months. You need our help.

This House has done nothing to respond to the President's request for \$1.9 billion in emergency funds. My friends, this is not a frivolous request.

What do emergency funds mean?

Someone said, just go write a check out of the operating budget of the United States. You want us to be more

fiscally responsible than that. We have a budget. We have funding that we have to obligate to the other needs of this Nation. The reason why the President rose to the level of the emergency funding, because emergency funding can come immediately outside of the budgeting process and begin to get these dollars to community health entities in our States and the Centers for Disease Control, who will have to be dispatched to our States to help if the epidemic becomes uncontrollable. No action.

One leader in this House said they are doing absolutely nothing in response to the President's request. They don't want to give him the money. Thank goodness the Senate has just passed a compromise, the other body, \$1.9 billion in emergency funding for this important effort that we must have.

I come from Houston that has a tropical climate, with many climatic similarities with other States along the Gulf Coast, parts of Central and South America, as well as the Caribbean. Tropical climates are hospitable to mosquitoes that carry the Zika virus. In addition, Houston has a large and very diverse population that travels to many parts of the Zika virus-impacted zones located throughout Central and South America and the Caribbean where mosquito transmission of the Zika virus is a primary means of exposure to the illness.

People coming back and forth into the United States, citizens, those who have legal documents will travel across this Nation. There is no reason to point to these individuals and make them scapegoats. We should be prepared.

What about vacationers?

No matter how much you have spoken about the Zika virus, there will be vacationers who will still be going to places because they planned their vacation. They are going right into the heart of the storm.

As we well know, those women who will become pregnant will be the prime target for a devastating impact on their embryo, their baby that may be born with severe brain damage, lifelong brain damage.

We held a hearing early in March because I knew that I could not wait to educate my community. I called the Zika virus planning meeting along the Gulf Coast that would include doctors, agency officials, community service and faith-based organizations to start to build the bridges between those communities to defeat Zika.

As you well know, the summer Olympics will be held this year, and all of our American athletes will be going to Brazil. Brazil is also one of the serious sites of the Zika-carrying mosquito. It is a very serious and important effort.

Communities across America should not be panicking, but they should be preparing their community health centers, their public health system to confront the Zika virus if it comes to their community either by way of an indi-

vidual who needs treatment or by chance of this mosquito.

□ 1215

So I have called for a national task force on the prevention of Zika virus infections in order to target funding for tropical climate areas, like Houston, south Texas, Florida, and other places in the southern region of the United States that have a tropical population, and to focus on the environmental cleanup of city water and trash near populated areas.

Most people are aware of the extreme flooding—20 inches of rain—that hit my community just 10 to 15 days ago. There were large amounts of sitting water and trash in a tropical area, tires. I visited a site in my district after the rains that had sitting water. It was just an open, welcoming place for the Zika-carrying mosquito.

I have also asked for public education campaigns targeting all public and private pediatric clinics and OB/GYN services for pregnant women. I need them to be educated that any mosquito repellent that does not have the DEET name on it is not sufficient.

If you are traveling overseas, your mosquito repellent must say the word "DEET," which was work that I did in the United States Congress a few years ago when mosquito repellents did not have that word on them. We worked legislatively and with the EPA to ensure that you knew if it had that component. And you must be careful in using that as well.

We want to provide DEET repellent free to certain high-risk populations, in cooperation with private companies. Demand for DEET products will likely increase because the Zika virus is in the news. We may run out. So it is important that companies need to be alerted to set aside products for tropical areas along the south Texas coast and other States along that tropical area going along the Gulf Coast: Alabama, as I have said, Florida, Mississippi, and others.

And keep children's wading pools empty of water, my friends.

These are goals that should be met. I encourage stakeholders to be calm, but to meet with your infectious disease physicians, who are in all of your communities, along with your public health leaders, faith leaders, and others, to educate about this particular disease.

It is important that we move on this call by the President. This is not frivolous. This is an effort that is as clear as if we had called a battalion into operation—the United States military—because we were under attack. This is prevention—being prepared for potential devastating impact.

These are not my words. One of the most renowned infectious disease doctors that we have the privilege of hosting in Houston at the Baylor College of Medicine, Dr. Peter Hotez, dean of the National School of Tropical Medicine and professor of pediatrics

and molecular virology and microbiology at the Baylor College of Medicine, said the following points:

Zika virus infections will increase over the next few months. Effects of the infections on pregnant women in the first trimester will be, certainly, dangerous. It will impact on the poor. Leadership to fight the spread of the Zika virus must be local and must start now.

Dr. Peter Hotez said that this particular mosquito is the greatest killer of people in the world. They are also called the yellow fever mosquito. Now they are acquiring the Zika virus. Dr. Hotez says we are expecting 4 million Zika cases in the next 4 months, and to date, there are over a million cases in Brazil.

Remember, we are traveling back and forth. As all of you know, this is a small world. No one is kept from traveling internationally. We don't close our borders, in terms of Americans traveling on business or other responsibilities that they have.

Pregnancy, during the first trimester of pregnancy if the mother is exposed to the Zika virus, it can invade the central nervous system. Let me say this more clearly. In pregnancy, if the mother is infected in the first trimester of pregnancy, it can invade the central nervous system of the developing baby and inhibit brain development, which can result in stillbirths and brain damage. It occurs in 1 of every 10,000 births. And the rate for Zika virus exposure far exceeds that number.

Brain damage undermines the development either at birth, or the brain fails to develop properly after birth. The child will have difficulty in walking, difficulty in hearing, and difficulty with speech. Not all developmental consequences are known.

This is Dr. Hotez:

Three factors together make Zika virus a threat to poor communities: high concentrations of poverty—sitting trash and tires that may be found in many of our more depressed areas—the presence of the mosquitos; environmental conditions that support mosquito breeding near people; and the lack of resources for people to isolate themselves from mosquitos, such as screens, replants, and air-conditioning.

Now, we all know that on the continent of Africa they have been able to bring down the epidemic of malaria by making sure that charities like the United Nations and the Gates Foundation give mosquito nets to the people to assist them.

Well, in the United States, I know a lot of people think everybody has air-conditioning and that their doors and windows are closed. That is not true. There are people who have no air-conditioning and have their windows open or they have screens that have holes in them. It is sad to think, but it is true.

Or they are outdoors. They are walking along places that have this kind of circumstance—not because we want it to be that way, but after a terrible and devastating storm like we had in Houston, we have mounds of trash.

I want to thank the mayor of the city of Houston and the Harris County Judge for working diligently on why I asked for extra money for these areas: to clean up these trash areas. Now we have extra trash because we had this terrible flood. People are still out of their homes, and trash is still piled up in many places.

We need partnerships critical to defeating the Zika virus-carrying mosquitos. Zika virus control requires more than spraying for mosquitos. Mosquito and animal control need to use the best methods for preventing the spread of the disease.

We can no longer say that disease is a problem from a foreign country, because it will be a problem here. Dr. Umair Shah said the important lesson from Ebola and Zika is that there is a strong connection between global health and domestic health.

So, my friends, I am sounding the alarm not for panic, but preparation and preparedness, education, outreach, personal precaution, and understanding how to move around during this time, to cover up to prevent mosquito bites day and night—prevent the bites day and night—environmental cleanup. If you do not have the spray, use a mosquito net that you can purchase.

It is important to note that the Zika virus is not a local mosquito population, but it will travel. Travelers must be educated regarding the Zika virus. And if you are wondering about our local atmosphere, let me tell you of the latest news.

Thirteen Zika virus cases are now reported in Virginia. Two new cases were reported on Thursday, both of them in the northern region of Virginia, according to the Virginia Department of Health. I did not say Brazil. I said Virginia. There are now 388 cases nationwide as of Thursday. According to the Centers for Disease Control, 33 with the virus are pregnant. This is an action that we cannot avoid.

For anyone that has not seen the Zika virus-carrying mosquito, this is a mighty powerful mosquito. And don't in any way have me suggest that this is the size of it, but you can see the elements of it; and what we are taught is that it is a pretty strong mosquito, not to be deterred. We must get prepared.

So, as we look to the elements of preparedness, let me share some other issues that I think need to be addressed. I thought this was so important. The national media has helped us try to bring it to people's attention. I put an article in Time magazine myself, "Congress Must Act Immediately to Combat Zika Virus."

We are serious about this and have to get serious. We cannot have the Senate in a compromise of \$1.1 billion on the emergency supplemental that the President has asked for, yet this House has not done anything.

We are now going for the district work recess. I will be going home to my district to visit those individuals who are underwater, whose properties

are outside of their home, mosquito gathering sites where trash is left not because they want to, but because so much has been torn up because of the water and we are waiting for it to be picked up. My community, my city needs these resources to do massive pickup of tires, massive cleanup of sitting water.

The Aedes mosquito is the most dangerous of the various Zika-carrying mosquitos. You can see that it is none too friendly looking. That is why I came to the floor today.

I want to leave with information directly to pregnant women, to give the information that we know to provide them with the importance of the issues that we are confronting.

I include in the RECORD letters, Mr. Speaker, that I wrote in March to the Secretary of Health and Human Services pleading for the task force. As well, I include a number of other items.

I also ask President Obama to look closely at the southern region and rim, where States like Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida are, because they will be the epicenter. Even though there are now 388 cases nationwide, 13 in Virginia, as the summer goes on, this is going to be of serious concern.

Let me suggest to you that this is a situation where women who are pregnant are taking heed. Pregnant women in Houston and their doctors weigh the risks of the Zika virus. This is a very real circumstance. And our climate is very tropical.

This mother, Tracy Smith, and her children are at their home. Smith is pregnant with twins, and she is worried about the approach of the mosquito season. So OB/GYN doctors are now having to prepare their mothers. What kind of protection should they take? What kind of mosquito repellent should they utilize? And what measures? Should they have mosquito nets inside their house, even though they may be living in an air-conditioned facility?

But what you say for one mother who may have a more economic level of opportunity than others, you need to say for the entire population of pregnant women, because there is no doubt. Dr. Hotez has said this is going to be a season where we have to be extremely concerned about the Zika virus and the Zika-carrying mosquito.

So what we are suggesting is mosquito traps. And they will be in these areas that are attractive to their environment and their trends: sitting water, dirty water, wading pools. They are not prohibited, if I might say, from getting an airplane ticket. They will get here on their own. We have to take it very seriously.

So, I want an immediate response by this House to pass the President's emergency supplemental and to work with the Senate on the \$1.1 billion that has been requested.

□ 1230

It is money to save lives of Americans. It is money to give pregnant

women comfort that their newborn child can be born in this country with the best opportunity for survival and, of course, to reach their fullest potential.

Many of you have seen the video, tragically, of those babies with small brains that have now been born in countries in South and Central America. It is a sentence, although we love everyone, that we should not render to an unborn child.

And to that mother who is looking forward to raising that child, either her first or along with her other children, let me tell you what the Zika virus will do. Pregnant women can be infected with the Zika virus, as I said. The primary way that pregnant women get the Zika virus is through the bite of an infected mosquito.

Zika virus can be spread by a man in sex partners. A pregnant woman can pass Zika virus to a fetus. Zika virus can be passed from a pregnant woman to a fetus during pregnancy or at delivery and then that impact comes at a later time.

If a pregnant woman is exposed, we don't know how likely she is to get Zika. If a pregnant woman is infected, we still don't know how the virus will affect her or her pregnancy.

We don't know how likely it is that Zika will pass to a fetus. We don't know, if the fetus is infected, if the fetus will develop birth defects. It means that they cannot cure this in the womb.

We don't know whether her baby will have birth defects. We don't know if sexual transmission of the Zika virus poses a different risk of birth defects than mosquito-borne transmission.

So, because we have all these questions, we need the \$1.9 billion that the President asked, but we need it to begin to answer these questions and we need to be able to have doctors like Dr. Hotez, a major leader in infectious disease, begin the research to know what is the best repellent not in terms of mosquito repellent, but what is the best scientific response to this dastardly and predictable potential of the Zika-carrying mosquito coming to the United States and having an impact on all of those who are excited about looking forward to the birth of a newborn baby.

I hope that, as we return from our work recess, this House and the Republican leadership, as was said earlier on the floor, end any partisan bickering, any debate or disagreement with the President of the United States, and accept the fact that he is the Commander-in-Chief and that his experts, the Centers for Disease Control, who are the entity to which all of us in our respective communities immediately turn for assistance on infectious diseases or natural disasters as it relates to health care—we call upon them to come to our districts and our States.

We ask them to help us and to make sure that we and our healthcare system are doing all that we can to be able to be helpful.

I do want to end by saying the reason why we are in such an alarm is there is now no vaccine to prevent or medicine to treat the Zika infection so that, if you are infected, as a mother, there is nothing right now. So we have to work on the research and the preventative aspect in order to protect these unborn children.

The illness can be mild, with symptoms lasting for several days to a week. But it is that unborn child right now and the larger impact we have yet to understand.

People may not be sick. They may not be sick enough to go to the hospital. They may not die. For this reason, people might not realize that they have been affected. That means we don't know whether their infection can cause someone else to be infected because we need to do more research.

We know it is transmitted by this mosquito. We need to make sure we understand whether there is any other kinds of transmissions that we have.

We know that there have been Zika travel advisory notices. We know that this is not a happy experience for the countries that we have listed.

But I feel compelled to say that the Zika virus has been noted in Cape Verde, the Caribbean, Aruba, Barbados, Bonaire, the Dominican Republic, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Jamaica, Martinique, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, U.S. territories St. Maarten, St. Vincent, The Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The Zika virus is in Central America—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—Mexico, the Pacific islands, American Samoa, the Marshall Islands, Samoa, Tonga.

The Zika virus is in South America: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guinea, Guyana, Paraguay, Surinam, and Venezuela.

I am not condemning these places. I am only asking that travelers take caution. And pregnant women need to take counsel from their OB-GYN.

So, my friends, our job and task here in this country is to be the umbrella on a rainy day. It is to ensure that the American people have all of the information that will help them make very important decisions.

It is to make sure that our health system and our doctors who are in their offices, in general medicine or internal medicine, have all the information and tools to be able to determine whether a woman has been infected and happens to be pregnant.

So my task here today is to say that we cannot wait. I am disturbed that we now have a week and we have not yet passed the emergency supplemental to help our friends in Puerto Rico, which, as I indicated, have a serious, serious opportunity to be without the resources that they need in the tropical climate that they are in to be able to confront the Zika virus. That is a U.S. territory. How unfair that is.

To my friends in this House, you cannot wait any longer. When we come

back, there needs to be on the floor of the House a bill passing the Senate compromise or the \$1.9 billion emergency supplemental that the President has asked for, as the Commander-in-Chief. We need to roll up our sleeves. We need to ensure that the American people are taken care of.

And I just want to add this: Our military personnel are in tropical climates. We can treat them with limited dignity absolutely not.

They must have both the medical personnel and the equipment to either be of assistance to places where they are, where the epidemic may be, as they did when they were sent to Africa to help set up a hospital structure that did not exist.

We don't know where this will be the worst, and I can assure you that our military personnel may be called on, working with the Centers for Disease Control. Are we going to leave them without the resources they need? I hope not.

I take my role on the Homeland Security Committee very seriously. It is our responsibility to deal with the security of this Nation.

We have excellent Members who are working hard, such as my dear friend DONALD PAYNE, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications. We work together to ensure that America is prepared.

Right now this Zika-carrying mosquito has the potential for being here in the United States and creating havoc among pregnant women and possibly others.

What is our task? It is, Mr. Speaker, to do our job and to prepare the American people. We owe that to the great and wonderful people of this Nation, to the mothers and fathers expecting that bundle of joy. We owe that to all of them.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, which has a core mission of emergency preparedness of state and local governments to be equipped to react to emergencies make me acutely aware of the potential for Zika Virus to be a real challenge for state and local governments in the coming months.

This emerging health issue is a matter of great importance and one that must be addressed in timely way through a coordinated effort by federal, state and local government joined with community partners.

Houston Texas has a tropical climate with many climatic similarities with other states along the Gulf Coast; parts of Central and South America as well as the Caribbean. Tropical climates are hospitable to mosquitoes that carry the Zika Virus.

In addition, Houston has a large and very diverse population that travels to many of the Zika Virus impacted zones located throughout Central and South America and the Caribbean where mosquito transmission of the Zika Virus is the primary means of exposure to the illness.

I have identified shared concerns among state, and local agency officials regarding a need to have a plan to address Zika Virus in

the Houston and Harris County area that would include every aspect of the community.

For these reasons, I called the Zika Virus planning meeting along the Gulf Coast that would include doctors, agency officials, community service and faith based organizations to start to build the bridges between these communities to defeat Zika whether it was contracted through travel or mosquito borne transmissions.

Houston is fortunate to have diverse community of pastors who serve people in need throughout the area. Part of the Zika Virus response must be to ensure that we are doing all that we can and should be doing to reach every community.

Congresswoman JACKSON LEE's work on environmental mosquito mitigation issues:

As Congresswoman I worked with the EPA to get the word DEET on labels for mosquito repellent that contained the ingredient that remains the most effective mosquito repellent on the market.

CDC recommends that DEET is safe for use on children 2 months of age or older.

Congresswoman JACKSON LEE's Action Plan:

National Taskforce on Prevention of Zika Virus infections;

Target Funding to Tropical Climate areas—like Houston and South Texas in the U.S.;

Focus environmental cleanup of sitting water, and trash (tires) near populated areas;

Public Education campaign targeting all public and private pediatrics practices and OB/GYN service for pregnant women;

DEET Repellent;

Provide DEET Repellent free to certain high risk populations incorporation with private companies [Demand for DEET products will likely increase because of Zika Virus in the news.]; Companies need to be alerted to sit aside product for tropical areas along the South Texas Coast that will have the strongest need for the products; and

Keep children's wading pools empty of water.

Goals of the Meeting of Congresswoman JACKSON LEE's March 10 Meeting in Houston Texas:

Engage stakeholders in a planning discussion on combating Zika Virus:

1. Learn what each agency is doing to address Zika Virus

2. Calm the community through information

3. Engage key stakeholders outside of government and health care in advance of Mosquito Season 2016

4. Outline the strategy to defeating Zika Virus breeding areas

5. Learn what needs to be done to effectively communicate with every community in the Houston/Harris County area

6. Discuss the emergency supplemental appropriations proposed by President Obama

What is Zika Virus:

Zika Virus is spread primarily through the bite of an infected *Aedes* [A-dees] species mosquito. It is important to remember that 80% of those who get the Zika Virus will feel no symptoms. The most common symptoms of Zika [Zee-Ka] are fever, rash, joint pain, and conjunctivitis (red eyes). The CDC reports based on what they know about the virus to date—Zika virus illness is usually mild with symptoms lasting for several days to a week after being bitten by an infected mosquito. People usually don't get sick enough to go to

the hospital, and they very rarely die of Zika. For this reason, many people might not realize they have been infected. Once a person has been infected, he or she is likely to be protected from future infections.

What is being done to address Zika Virus:

Federal: President Obama is seeking \$1.6 Billion in emergency supplemental appropriations to fund Zika Virus mitigation; response, local and state federal agency programs that address environmental clean up; public education, community engagement, testing; and mosquito abatement.

CDC has a disease surveillance unit at Bush Intercontinental Airport.

Importance of advocating for the President's request:

Congresswoman JACKSON LEE advised that offices that will benefit from the resources to fight Zika Virus in their communities should make their views known regarding the emergency supplemental appropriations.

Speakers:

Dr. Peter Hotez, Dean of the National School of Tropical Medicine and Professor of Pediatrics and Molecular Virology & Microbiology, Baylor College of Medicine, said.

4 Key points:

1. Zika Virus infections will increase over the next few months

2. Effects of the infections on pregnant women (first trimester)

3. Impact on the poor

4. Leadership to fight the spread of Zika Virus must be local

Dr. Peter Hotez said that *Aedes Aegyptus* mosquitoes are the greatest killer of people in the world. They are also called the yellow fever mosquito.

Dr. Peter Hotez we are expecting 4 million Zika Virus cases in the next four months and to date there are over a million cases in Brazil.

Pregnancy during the first trimester of pregnancy if the mother is exposed to the Zika Virus it can invade the central nervous system of the developing baby and inhibit brain development, which can result in:

Still births;

Microcephaly [occurs in about 1 in every 10,000 births] the rate for Zika Virus exposure far exceeds that number. Microcephaly is brain under development either at birth or brain fails to develop properly after birth: Difficulty walking, Difficulty hearing, Difficulty with speech.

[Not all developmental or health consequences are known]

There are no tests to detect the virus, but not vaccine or cure.

Three factors together make Zika Virus a threat to poor communities: High concentrations of poverty; the presence of the *Aedes* mosquitoes; environmental conditions that support mosquito breeding near people and a lack of resources for people to isolate themselves from mosquitoes [screens, replants, air conditioning, etc.].

Zika virus disease in pregnant women in Bahia, Paraiba, and Pernambuco states, supports an association between Zika virus infection during early pregnancy and the occurrence of microcephaly.

Primary source of the virus is through infected mosquito bites. People to people transmissions are rare, but can occur if the virus load in the body is high sexual contact can spread the virus.

Leadership must be local; the CDC is only serving in a technical advisory role to local and state governments.

Dr. Umair Shah Executive Director for Harris County Public Health & Environmental Services, said:

Key points:

1. Partnerships are critical to defeating Zika Virus carrying mosquitoes

2. Zika Virus control requires more than spraying for mosquitoes

3. Mosquito and animal control use the best methods for preventing the spread of disease

Dr. Umair Shah said that the important lesson from Ebola and Zika is there is a strong connection between global health and domestic health.

We can no longer say that disease is a problem from that foreign country, because it will be a problem for the United States if it is not addressed wherever it might originate.

He said that you can only effectively clap with two hands. The partnerships that must be developed among local, state and federal agencies as well as community leaders are critical to the success of winning a fight against the Zika Virus.

Mosquito control will not be enough to deal with Zika Virus because the host mosquito that is a primary carrier has evolved to live on human blood—even when given a choice of animal or human blood the *Aedes Egypti* will choose human blood. It lives near the ground—so spraying in the air will not work; it likes to be near people; it requires very little water to breed; it can hide under leaves, and will seek out homes where people live.

Zika Virus response requires a new approach:

Education;

Outreach;

Personal precaution:

Cover up to prevent mosquito bites day and night: Slogan "Prevent the bite day and night"

Environmental cleanup—removing things that will hold water, small wading pools for children, gutters, grills, tires, toys, trash, etc.

If you do not have air conditioning use a WHOPES approved net like Pramax (156 holes per square inch and long enough to tuck under the mattress)

Permethrin-treated bed nets provide more protection—do not wash them or expose them to sunlight, which would break down an insecticide that kills mosquitoes and other insects.

Important to note: Zika Virus is not in the local mosquito population yet.

All domestic Zika cases except one have been linked to travel.

Travelers must be educated regarding Zika Virus. They should know the symptoms and should seek care. They should not fear being shunned for having the virus.

Dr. Dubboun, Director of the Harris County Public Health Environmental Services Mosquito Control Division, prior to his current public service he served 25 years in the military.

Harris County Health Department Zika Website: <http://www.hcphe.org/publications/hcphe responds/ 2016 zi ka virus/>

Key points:

1. Get rid of the mosquito breeding habitat.

2. Ecologically people are the preferred food source for *Aedes* mosquitoes.

3. No need to panic.

4. The solution to Zika Virus is community involvement.

Dr. Dubboun traveled to Brazil to join others in his field to sharing information on mosquito control with the hope of determining the best practices to achieve better results.

Dr. Dubboun said that the best approach to ending the threat of Zika virus is to get rid of the habitat that is used by the mosquito to breed. Ecologically people are the preferred food source for the Aedes mosquitoes.

He said that there was no need to panic because the weather right now (March 10, 2016–April 30, 2016) is not great for mosquito breeding, which means we have time to address environmental issues that support Aedes mosquito breeding.

Spraying will not work to control the Aedes aegypti mosquito because this mosquito does not fly in the air—it stays close to the ground; can breed in very small amounts of water; and hide very well.

The solution to fighting the Zika Virus is community involvement in working to minimize the habitats that allow Zika Virus carrying mosquitoes to breed.

Dr. Gruber, Assistant Commissioner from Regional and Local Health Services for the State of Texas:

Key points:

1. Number of cases in Texas and nearly have are in Harris County they are travel related except one;

2. Core ways to address key elements of a stop Zika effort.

Dr. Gruber said that he was there from the state to listen to what was being said and to communicate that the state was planning to support communities in combating Zika Virus.

On April 14 the state of Texas there have been 31 confirmed cases of Zika Virus, we know this because the patients were ill enough to seek medical attention and the tests were positive. Twelve of those cases were in Harris County.

It is important to note that 80% of people who will be infected will have no symptoms, which means it is not possible to know how many people have returned from travel with the virus or antibodies after having been exposed.

1. Core ways to address the existence of Zika Virus:

a. Health community communication with the public;

b. Correct vector control;

c. Surveillance;

d. Planning;

e. Keep yards clean; i. Communicate to authorities any needs for services to assist with clean up or to address environmental issues related to Zika.

f. The battle against Zika must be viewed as a community fight—we must enroll people to become members of the Public Health Army.

Bishop James Dixon, Community of Faith Church:

Key points:

1. The poor are not equipped to protect themselves from anything;

2. Education is key;

3. Access to the Community is essential;

4. Many churches have Haiti Missions that must be educated on this issue;

5. Larger forum to engage the community on the issues of Zika Virus

6. See others in the world as our neighbors, not as foreigners.

Bishop Dixon said that we must stop seeing the people of other nations as foreigners but neighbors.

People who are poor do not have the means of helping themselves. By the very definition of poverty—it is not just a state of

being, but a state of existence, a state of mind, and the source of our ability to be compassionate, not just think compassionately.

Education is key to reaching those who are most in need, but breaking through the barriers of poverty will require a great deal of effort.

People must come from outside of these communities into them to knock on doors, pick up trash, hang mosquito netting, hand out DEET and show people how to use it, help the elderly who cannot do their own yard clean up, share with people the city and county numbers to call to remove trash and tires, and teach people how to police their yards for items that will allow mosquitoes to breed.

Prevention of Zika Virus transmission to humans must be the goal.

Houston has a very diverse community of pastors, ministers and religious community leaders who should be part of this discussion and the solution.

Dr. S.J. Gilbert Houston Metropolitan said that he wanted to bring the Zika Virus issue to the attention of the diverse ministers community and would support efforts by Congresswoman Jackson Lee.

Dr. Raouf Arafat Houston Health and Human Services Office of Surveillance and Public Health Preparedness said:

Key points:

1. Houston routinely deals with medical or health related emergencies;

2. The talent in the city and county government health departments are unmatched in other locations around the nation;

3. We work well together and see each other as partners;

4. The Laboratory serves the entire area with testing services;

5. Training of public health workers is essential; and

6. Communication is essential.

City of Houston Website on Zika: http://www.houstontx.gov/health/Epidemiology/Zika_Virus.html.

Dr. Arafat said that through surveillance and public health efforts that Houston routinely responds to and effectively addresses emergencies that never see the light of day because they are well managed.

Disease control and prevention are areas where Houston excels and very few areas of the country have a combination of very talented people working in city and county government on the issue of public health.

We have laboratory services that can test for Zika Virus, but only in cases where the CDC guidelines are met, e.g., recent travel to a region with the virus, symptoms consistent with the infection, etc.

As I have said the virus carrying mosquitoes are not in the Houston area.

My purpose in working on this issue is to make sure that Houston along with other Gulf Coast communities is prepared for the 2016 mosquito season.

The U.S. has the experience and we should use it to help other nations, by doing so we also help ourselves. The strength of the U.S. approach is the systems that have been built up and developed over time. These systems allow for us in Houston and Harris County to know if something serious is occurring in the city.

On January 1, 2016 people in this field of disease control expressed a position that it was important to start working on Zika Virus

issues, but no one else was thinking about the virus. By January 29 everyone was talking about Zika Virus.

Stephen Williams, Director of Houston Health Department, said:

Key points:

1. There is no need to be alarmed;

2. We have been thinking about this for some time;

3. The key to success will be personal responsibility; and

4. Environmental work has already begun.

Community action is important to meeting the challenge and each person must play a part in the overall success of the plan.

The school education plans for Zika Virus in Houston Texas will begin in early to late April.

During this same period they will be doing a visibility campaign for the public to learn about protecting themselves from the virus, which will include multipurpose centers and community health clinics.

There is no need for alarm about the topic of Zika, we deal with and take care of situations on a daily basis that no one ever knows about that are serious.

We will be successful in Houston if the funding the President requested are approved by Congress.

The city of Houston began ramping up waste cleanup in low income areas like the 3rd Ward located in my District by going after illegal dump sites.

However, breeding sources in yards is not something the city or county can take care of.

If the trash is in a vacant lot or on the side of the road that is the government's responsibility, but private property is the owner's or occupant's responsibility.

Houston has organized an incident command structure to combat Zika Virus, which is the effort to better coordinate resources and planning across agencies.

Houston Sanitation Department is part of that effort.

Dr. David Persse, Physician Director, Emergency Medical Services, Houston Public Health Authority, said:

Key points:

1. Houston Emergency Command Center;

2. Solid Waste Collection efforts;

3. Phase I of Zika Virus Response;

4. Phase II of Zika Virus Response.

Dr. Persse said Houston's Emergency Command Center has been ramped up, which includes Houston Department of Solid Waste, Department of Housing and Air Port Authorities, etc.

Dr. Persse said Houston and Harris County are in Phase I of the Zika Virus preparation where there is no virus in mosquitoes in the area and the only cases are coming from those who have traveled to areas where the infection is transmitted by mosquito bite.

During this phase Houston and Harris County will focus on environmental cleanup of breeding sites and education of homeowners about breeding mosquito sites on their property.

Goal: Get rid of breeding sites.

Phase II will focus on mosquito breeding and will start in mid-to late April into May.

Julie Graves, (Confirmed) MD, MPH, PhD Regional Medical Director Health Service Region 6/SS Texas Department of State Health Services, said:

Dr. Graves said that the need to coordinate among all agencies responsible for Zika Virus

preparation, public education, remediation and control was critical. She said that chikungunya virus spread in the Caribbean was attributed to the lack of cooperation among governments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

[TIME, Apr. 20, 2016]

CONGRESS MUST ACT IMMEDIATELY TO
COMBAT ZIKA VIRUS

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS NEED FEDERAL FUNDING
TO PREVENT OUTBREAKS

(By Sheila Jackson Lee)

Members of Congress recently received news so chilling that it is imperative that they take immediate action to approve the about \$1.9 billion in emergency funding for Zika preparedness requested by the Obama administration. According to Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Disease, the mosquito that carries the Zika virus, which is already spreading rapidly in Latin America and the Caribbean, has been detected in nearly 30 states and could infect hundreds of thousands of people in Puerto Rico.

In Brazil, Zika has been identified as the cause in many recent cases of microcephaly, a birth defect resulting in babies being born with small heads and developmental problems. Zika poses a special risk for pregnant women since the virus can be transmitted through the bloodstream to the fetus. Previously, it was thought that Zika was only a problem during the first trimester of pregnancy, but according to officials at the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, it has now been learned that the virus is likely to be a problem throughout the term of pregnancy.

In February, the Obama administration requested Congress to approve about \$1.9 billion in emergency Zika prevention funding, but to date Republican congressional leadership has not acted. If Congress does not act to approve the urgently needed funding, federal public health agencies will be forced to divert funding away from research into malaria, tuberculosis and a universal flu vaccine.

It is outrageous that the Republican congressional leadership is putting at risk the health and safety of hundreds of thousands of persons by refusing to do its job. The impact of that failure of responsibility is likely to be felt most severely in the congressional districts like the one I represent in Houston, Texas.

Because the summer months in areas along the Gulf Coast and the southwest region of the United States are unusually long and hot, Houston is expected to be an epicenter of any Zika outbreak in the U.S. In impoverished areas of the city and county, there are many open ditches in residential areas and lots where tires are illegally dumped. These are ideal breeding habitats for *Aedes aegypti*, the mosquito species that carries the Zika virus. Experts now know that it can also be transmitted in other ways, including sex.

Mosquito control will not be sufficient to limit the spread of the Zika virus because the *Aedes aegypti* has evolved to live on human blood, which it will choose over animal blood whenever it has the opportunity to do so. This breed of mosquito lives near the ground and near people, which limits the effectiveness of areole spraying. The *Aedes aegypti* mosquito can breed in a habitat as small as a cup of dirty water, it can hide under leaves, and it will seek out homes where people live.

To combat the threat posed by Zika, it is essential that the public be enlisted as the first line of defense. But for this effort to be

successful, resources must be available to implement community-based mosquito control and abatement programs. That is why I have called upon the Republican congressional leadership to approve the requested about \$1.9 billion emergency Zika prevention funding immediately, with \$100 million dedicated to support local government efforts to conduct environmental cleanup activities to remove items in populated areas that promote mosquito breeding. This funding would also support coordinated public-education campaigns to encourage proactive efforts to seek early medical care when Zika virus symptoms are present, or early in a pregnancy.

The funding would also provide the resources to teach community residents how to check for and safely address mosquito breeding areas; repair or replace broken or torn door and window screens; and provide DEET mosquito replant products to low-income communities and mosquito netting for beds in homes that have no air conditioning.

Last month, I convened the first of what are planned to be several strategic planning sessions with state and local officials to prevent any outbreak or spread of the Zika virus. Here in Houston and Harris County we are prepared to meet this serious challenge to public health and safety with determination and resolve. All we are lacking is the federal funding needed to succeed. And that is why Congress must act immediately.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 10, 2016.

Hon. SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL,

Secretary of Health and Human Services, U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MATHEWS BURWELL: I applaud the President and commend his designation of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as the lead federal agency charged with responding to the threat posed by the Zika virus. I am writing to request that the Department of Health and Human Services establish a National Taskforce on the Prevention of Zika Virus infections in pregnant women and girls.

The Zika Virus is a serious illness for pregnant girls and women. Zika virus can be spread from a pregnant woman to her fetus and has been linked to a serious birth defect of the brain called microcephaly in babies of mothers who had Zika virus while pregnant. Other problems have been detected among fetuses and infants infected with Zika virus before birth, such as absent or poorly developed brain structures, defects of the eye, hearing deficits, and impaired growth. CDC recommends special precautions for pregnant women. There is no treatment or cure for those infected with Zika Virus.

Experts believe the Zika Virus will be a seasonal epidemic for North America, but will primarily affect those states in the south and will flare up in the summer and continue into the fall in tropical zones. As you know, in Texas we have had particularly hot and long summers, with tropical zones along the Gulf Coast that include Houston Texas. There are two types of the *Aedes* mosquitoes known to carry the virus that found in the Houston area. Houston will possibly be ground zero for the United States because of environmental conditions that support breeding of mosquitoes that are known to carry Zika Virus in the Americas that are found in close proximity to low income areas and the proximity. Prevention measures consist of community based mosquito control programs that are able to reduce vector populations and personal protection measures to reduce the likelihood of being bitten by infected mosquitoes.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,

Member of Congress.

THESE ARE THE TIMES THAT TRY
MEN'S SOULS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting time. Sometimes you think about the literary quote "These are the times that try men's souls," but there have been trying times before and there will be again.

But our Congress continues to be urged to do things that sound like a great solution, sound like a good, compassionate thing to do, but when you get to the bottom of them, sometimes they are the most uncompassionate things we could do.

For example, there are reports of sexual abuse victims who are female being deeply troubled. There are FBI statistics that indicate that perhaps 18, maybe 20, percent of women in America have been sexually assaulted. Other types of crimes on females raise the percentage even higher.

There are statistics that indicate transgender may be three-tenths of 1 percent. Who knows what the right numbers are? But I think we should be far more compassionate with female sexual abuse victims that comprise such a large number in weighing whether you want to have men come walking in on women in restrooms, dressing rooms.

Also, the talk has been this year that we are going to have sentencing reform because it is the compassionate thing to do.

We are told that there are massive, massive numbers of people who have been incarcerated in Federal prison for simple possession cases, and we have moved on. We have evolved in this country where we don't look on those as critically. So it is time to start releasing some of those people.

Having been a judge of a felony court, I can't say I did the right thing on sentencing in every case, but I can say I struggled. I got all the information that was available. I considered it before we ever undertook the sentencing hearing. I considered everything submitted at the sentencing hearing and wrestled and tried to get to a just and appropriate sentence.

Judges do that all over the country. Some think they are being compassionate and quickly release criminals, not being quite as dedicated to reviewing backgrounds and the indications of repeat offenses to come. So they release people too quickly, sentence them too lightly, and they go back and commit other offenses.

We know from the recidivism rate that is going to happen, but you try

your best, as a judge, to do the right thing.

Then the thought of someone in Washington that never ever reviewed all of the facts of the case, never heard all of the evidence that you or the jury heard in assessing sentence, who have just got some big picture that they think they may be able to apply and generalize sufficiently—the thought is repugnant that they would come in and say: We are going to have this blanket set aside, a reduction in the sentence that was achieved through a very deliberative process.

□ 1245

There are also a lot of fallacies and a lot of fiction that has been thrown out regarding sentences, some vast many that have been sentenced to and sitting in Federal prison for just having a little bit of marijuana; we have got to let those go.

Anybody that has prosecuted knows, whether you have prosecuted as a State prosecutor or a Federal prosecutor, Federal prosecutors have traditionally not been interested in small possession cases. They are not interested. They weren't in east Texas.

When I was in court, when I have been a prosecutor and a judge, the State prosecutors in east Texas and the Federal prosecutors actually worked very well together. Every now and then there might be a rare case where the State prosecutors would realize that there was a very heinous offense that was committed, but the Federal Court may have a higher range of punishment, and because this person is such a threat to society, might ask the Federal prosecutors to take a look to see if this is something you would be interested in pursuing. More often than not it was not. But most of those cases are handled in State court.

I don't have any doubt that we should be reviewing drug offenses when it comes to the new opium-related cases. There have been so many developments. We have got development of synthetics now that were not known, so they are not listed as items that would generate a prison sentence, that do enough damage to individuals that they should be considered to be listed in a crime to possess. So those are things we need to be constantly looking at.

There is an article from Adam Kredo of the Free Beacon from yesterday. The headline is: "Obama Administration Freed 19,723 Criminal Illegal Immigrants in 2015."

It says: "The Obama administration released nearly 20,000 illegal immigrants convicted of crimes from custody in 2015, according to new figures published by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement bureau. The 19,723 illegals freed from custody during the last year had a total of 64,197 convictions between them, according to the data. This included 8,324 violent convictions and 208 homicide convictions."

Those are people who came into the country illegally who not only broke

our immigration laws to come into the country, but some of them are coming in more than once illegally, some after they have been deported and come back in to commit more crimes, but nearly 20,000 released in 2015, according to Immigration and Customs Enforcement, according to ICE, and it doesn't appear that they are all being deported.

Certainly if they were, there is no bar to them turning right around and coming back. One man who had, I think it was, nine DWI cases that came before me in a felony court, and the Federal authorities had never been interested in deporting him until he had a violent accident. He came before me, and I sent him, appropriately, to prison. Within 6 months he is back in my court. So I had to ask, through the interpreter, that since I sent him to prison, how is he back in my court for a new crime of violence on other people?

It turned out that very shortly after I sent him to prison, finally, the Federal authorities acted—just much too late for victims that were involved—and they deported him. According to what he said through his interpreter, they took him down to the border and watched him go across the border. Then as soon as the people that deported him left, that same day, that same hour, he came right back across the border.

What about all the victims? Do we want to talk about compassion? What about all the victims of the people who have been harmed, hurt, and obviously cases of people being killed because we don't secure our border, and instead of letting people serve out the sentences that a court very deliberately sentenced, they let them go?

As if we are some ubiquitous group here in Washington, somehow once you come into the District of Columbia, we are so much wiser than any judge sitting on any court anywhere in the Federal system that we know better than they did.

I can tell you I have heard from judges from around the country that:

If I had known that some jerk in Washington was going to come around and reduce my sentence that I agonized to arrive at, I would have sentenced much more harshly so that the appropriate sentence would have been what was arrived at by the brilliant, wise, ubiquitous jerk in Washington that set it aside too early.

This article from April 12 is: "Sentencing Reform Legislation Would Disproportionately Favor Noncitizens."

It says: "U.S. prisoner data clearly shows two things. One, the majority of low-level drug offenders are serving their sentences in State, not Federal prisons. Two, most of those incarcerated in Federal prison for drug charges are noncitizens. While it may be worthwhile to pursue reform at the Federal level, it will do very little to address the problems identified by proponents of sentencing reform, and it would do almost nothing to reduce sentences for U.S. citizen drug offenders."

In fact, on further down it says:

"As of April 7, 2016, there were 196,285 prisoners in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, with 46.5 percent of these prisoners—91,270—sentenced for drug offenses. The percentage of prisoners incarcerated for drugs is just over 2½ times greater than the State prison population. However, overall, there are fewer prisoners serving time in Federal prison for drug charges than in State prisons," which have 212,000.

"The Federal Government collects data differently for State and Federal prisoners. In order to get the breakdown of offenses for Federal drug prisoners, data from the U.S. Sentencing Commission is available. Looking at the sentencing statistics from FY 2007 to FY 2015, a clear distinction between Federal and State prison populations is that the proportion of Federal prisoners serving time for drug possession is much higher than that for State prisoners, and Hispanics are disproportionately represented among Federal drug inmates . . . There is a higher ratio of Hispanics serving drug sentences for both trafficking and possession convictions in Federal prisons. As Daniel Horowitz points out, this is because many of the drug offenders in Federal prison are serving sentences for drug convictions related to the illicit drug trade on the U.S.-Mexico border.

"In response to a congressional request regarding sentencing data for Federal drug offenses, the U.S. Sentencing Commission sent data showing that 95 percent of the 305 individuals serving time in Federal prison for simple drug offenses are noncitizen . . . only 13 simple possession cases were tried in nonborder districts in FY 2014 . . . In a letter sent to Senator JEFF SESSIONS last fall, the Federal Bureau of Prisons reported that 77 percent of individuals convicted of Federal drug possession charges and more than 25 percent of individuals convicted of Federal drug trafficking charges in FY 2015 were noncitizen."

Sometimes graphs give us a good look and give us a better picture of what we are talking about than a word picture does. So here is what the Federal Bureau of Prisons reported last fall, that of all the people in prison, in Federal prison, U.S. Federal prison for drug possession charges and convictions, 77 percent are noncitizens of the United States.

That is right. We are using our United States prisons when it comes to Federal possession of drugs. Seventy-seven percent of them housed are noncitizens. Twenty-three percent of those in Federal prison for drug possession charges and convictions are citizens of the United States.

"The profile for Federal drug prisoners is different than at the State level, and this is why Congress needs to recognize and address these differences when crafting legislation that will effect this population. Federal drug and immigration enforcement are for now

inextricably tied together, and Mexican drug cartels are a serious threat to public safety. A serious debate over how to best address the War on Drugs and its effects on American communities can not ignore the immigration component.

“Sentencing reform bills reducing penalties for some Federal prisoners . . . are being portrayed by their supporters as a long overdue corrective to harsh sentencing laws for individuals who violate Federal drug laws, which they argue create racial disparities in the Nation’s prison population.

“Reforming drug sentencing laws is one thing. Releasing criminal aliens back into U.S. interior is quite another. The Obama administration has already shown its willingness to do the latter, including those who were deemed to be criminal threats to the public. Without a bill with strong, clear language and, most importantly, a Congress willing to extend oversight over the executive branch, it is plain that the sentencing reform legislation likely to soon come before Congress will accomplish little more than to provide an early release for dangerous criminal aliens, while still failing to hold President Obama to account for his failure to enforce U.S. immigration law.”

This article from Daniel Horowitz from this month’s *Conservative Review* said: “Yes, it was all an April Fool’s joke. The entire rationale and premise on which the top legislative priority of the D.C. people was built is an illusion. On a Federal level, there is no widespread epidemic of people being locked up for nonviolent drug offenses.

“The entire debate over the prison population on a Federal level is absurd. Proponents of jailbreak legislation speak about the issue in the abstract and concoct all sorts of myths as to who is sentenced for Federal crimes.

“This is, in fact, a finite and verifiable population. Why don’t we stop talking past each other and actually take a look at what is the 800-pound gorilla behind the Federal criminal justice system?”

□ 1300

From there he goes on to talk about illegal immigration and the effect on our prisons. He said:

“What is clear when you juxtapose the total convictions to the large number of immigration-related sentences and the drug trafficking convictions, the 800-pound gorilla in the room when dealing with Federal crimes, is—illegal immigration. Both directly, by clogging up the system with immigration cases, and indirectly, through the open border and drug cartels and proliferation of drugs, more than half of all Federal sentences are a byproduct of immigration and the drugs that are brought in as a result of the porous border . . . Hence, the entire premise of Federal jailbreak legislation—that there are infinite numbers of individuals serving time in Federal prison for

‘nonviolent drug offenses’—is complete bunk.

“If we would deal with the immigration problem and keep out much of the drug infestation by building the fence”—it doesn’t have to be a wall—“and implementing visa tracking, both the direct effects of immigration and the drug problem, which is a byproduct of immigration, would reach a manageable level. We would save a lot of money on incarceration costs and dramatically reduce the prison population, all without risking the safety and security of Americans by indiscriminately and retroactively releasing violent criminals into our communities.”

And people should understand, what most prosecutors will tell you is, especially in the Federal system—they don’t have plea agreements like normally you find in most States—they agree on what charges they will allow a defendant to plea to and which ones they will drop. So, if there is violence in an offense, if there is a gun used in a drug offense or violence in a drug offense and a Federal prosecutor is trying to get someone involved for carrying out that violent drug offense, but they know they want to get the guy that is over this one, they want to get the bigger fish and the even bigger fish, they are going to have to have some kind of negotiation at that level. And what they negotiate is: “All right. We will leave off the violent part of this offense and let you plead to that,” or, “We will leave out the burglary,” or, “We will leave out this other. We will leave out something else and we will let you plea to this, and the State has agreed they won’t pursue that burglary.” They work out an agreement so that part of the offense that would have gotten them a much more severe sentence is left out in return for their cooperation to go after the bigger fish.

So when somebody in Washington that has not analyzed the facts of each case and the reason for the recommended charge to be accepted by the court goes about and just releases somebody, they are normally going to do an injustice to the victims. Some say drugs are a victimless crime. Some are tempted to think that until they look at the involvement of drugs and violent crime in burglaries. It is phenomenal.

With a porous border the way we have, we see the drugs pouring in. And I literally say “we see.”

We had a hearing yesterday with a lady who lived down near the border. Actually, she pointed out that our Federal law enforcement immigration officials are about 25 miles north of the border. We are not enforcing the border there in Arizona where she was pointing out. She and her husband put up video cameras and displayed it in the hearing. Clearly, these were guys carrying big amounts of something, apparently drugs, passing by back and forth, just bringing drugs into America because we were not enforcing and securing our border and our country.

If we want to have true sentencing reform, it should not be undertaken until the border is secure so that we know we are not releasing more criminals to the interior of the United States to commit more crimes and to be back involved in the drug trade.

I know some years back, after I got here, Congress decided to make it more difficult for people to get Sudafed because it was used in the process of producing methamphetamine. In east Texas, cooking methamphetamine was a problem. But most of the cooks stunk, so when people would smell something violent and they called in, immediately law enforcement would think, oh, maybe some meth is being cooked. They would go, and often that was the case. So we made it hard for law-abiding people to get Sudafed that works a whole lot better than Sudafed with any initials after it that is not true Sudafed.

Some in the DEA and law enforcement back in Texas tell me what has happened: Yeah, we were able to shut down a lot of methamphetamine cooking in Texas, but since our border is so porous, the drug cartels in Mexico right across our border are pouring through synthetics and far more potent drugs. They are hooking our young people, our Americans, on drugs that are harder to get off of and induce more unpleasantness and crime.

We really didn’t solve anything because we didn’t deal with what was called the 800-pound gorilla in the room. It is illegal immigration. It is an unsecured border.

And, of course, some can’t help but raise questions about political motivation. Because when you are trying desperately to win, say, a Presidential election or a local election, say, in Virginia, and you know from surveys that have been done, if you can restore the voting rights to people that have been in prison, a big majority of those will vote Democrat, and then when you think about the potential—wow.

So if we just cut loose a massive number of illegal immigrants that are in prison, and then you have a Governor like you have in Virginia who then says, hey, we are going to let felons have voting rights, never mind you are not supposed to vote unless you are a U.S. citizen, we are finding that there is fraud in elections despite what some say.

My friend John Fund had a good book on the fraud involved in elections and the voting process around the country. Look, if we are going to stop from disenfranchising real voters and real American citizens, then we have got to make sure that we have legitimate voters. That means voter ID. Why not? I mean, you have got to have an ID to do much of anything in this country. Why not have one and make sure that the disenfranchising process is not happening because we make sure that every voter is a legitimate voter?

Those who were worried about it preventing minorities from voting, go

look at places like Georgia. It has been established that, when photo ID requirements were added, there were actually more minorities that voted after that. It didn't just disfranchise the minority. What it disenfranchised were people that wanted to vote as illegal aliens or illegally.

But parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but wonder if you were the head of a political party, hypothetically, if you were the head of a political party and your party believed their hope for winning the next election was to get people who were felons to vote, whether they reformed or not, maybe it is time to take a look at what your party stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE FINCA VIGIA FOUNDATION: A VERY SPECIAL U.S.-CUBA COLLABORATION TO RESTORE AND PRESERVE THE CUBAN HOME OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Finca Vigia Foundation, based in Massachusetts, and the extraordinary model it provides of what Americans and Cubans working together can accomplish.

Over the past 13 years, this special collaboration has restored and protected the home, documents, and related materials of Ernest Hemingway's home in Cuba, the Finca Vigia, located 12 miles outside of Havana, in the village of San Francisco de Paula.

Like so many stories on Capitol Hill, this one began when a visitor from Massachusetts walked into my office. Jenny Phillips had an interesting story to tell because her grandfather was Ernest Hemingway's editor and long-time friend, Maxwell Perkins.

She and her husband, Frank, had traveled to Cuba earlier that year to visit the Finca Vigia, which the Cubans had lovingly cared for and operated as a museum since Hemingway's death. We are grateful to those Cubans because there would be no Hemingway House without their decades of devotion to his memory and his legacy.

In addition to touring the house and grounds, Jenny and Frank also saw thousands of Hemingway documents and photographs that were in boxes and containers in the basement, most unknown to writers and researchers. They recognized the priceless value of these papers to Hemingway scholars worldwide, but they also knew that the political divide between the United States and Cuba made their preservation and accessibility a problem.

Listening to her describe what was at stake, we took the first steps that would result in a wonderful binational process to save Hemingway's docu-

ments; preserve the architecture and physical structure of his home; restore his famous boat, the Pilar; and conserve and protect the contents of his home, including original furniture, clothing, a 9,000-volume library, original galley proofs and manuscripts, and over 4,000 photographs. Time and tropical climates are not kind to these delicate materials.

Partnering with the Social Science Research Council here in the United States, the Cuban Ministry of Culture, and the Cuban National Cultural Heritage Council, the CNPC, a plan of action was outlined to carry out a joint preservation project in Cuba and to conserve digitized and microfilm copies of all documents located in Hemingway's home to the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum and to the Cuban National Cultural Heritage Council.

In 2002, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between Eric Hershberg with the Social Science Research Council; Dr. Marta Arjona Perez of the CNPC; and witnessed by Frank and Jenny Phillips; Sandra Spanier with Pennsylvania State University and general editor of the Hemingway Letters Project; Sean, Angela, and Hilary Hemingway, who are the grandson, daughter-in-law, and niece of Ernest Hemingway; President Fidel Castro; and myself. Dozens of Cubans and Americans attended the signing, including my wife, Lisa.

Since then, scores of Cubans and Americans have worked together to make the dream of preserving this priceless legacy of Ernest Hemingway a reality.

□ 1315

This includes officials at the State Department, at the Commerce Department, and at the Department of the Treasury in both the Bush and Obama administrations who recognized the importance to America and the world in saving Hemingway's cultural history in Cuba and helped the project navigate the complicated requirements of U.S. regulations and license applications.

I would especially like to note and thank the many Cuban cultural officials and preservation, architectural, museum, and technical experts who made this dream come true. And I apologize if I leave anyone out.

I would like to begin with Cuban President Fidel Castro, whose unconditional support was essential to moving this project forward, as well as Josefina Vidal during her service at the Cuban Interests Section here in Washington and later, following her return to Havana.

I want to highlight the role of then-Minister of Culture, the iconic Abel Prieto, who was such an enthusiastic and encouraging voice when we first began reaching out to Cuban officials in 2002, as well as his successors, Rafael Bernal and the current Minister of Culture, Julian Gonzalez Toledo.

Central to the success of the restoration and preservation of Hemingway's house, grounds, and its contents are:

Marta Arjona Perez, now deceased, who was the visionary voice on the project when she was president of the Cuban National Cultural Heritage Council, the CNPC;

Gladys Collazo Usallan, who is the current president of the CNPC, as well as her predecessors Manuel Palacios Soto and Margarita Ruiz Brandi;

Nestor Garciaga, vice president of the CNPC and chief conservator of the Hemingway papers;

Gladys Rodriguez Ferrero, long associated with the Hemingway collection and buildings and the former director of The Finca Vigia Museum, has been one of the most influential voices and actors in the preservation and restoration projects;

Ada Rosa Alfonso, the current director of The Finca Vigia Museum, and Isabel Ferrero, the current deputy director of the museum;

Architect Enrique Hernandez Castillo;

Structural engineer Livan Yanes Diaz;

Historic preservation architects Fernando Sanchez Rodriguez and Marco Antonio Vidal Garcia;

Conservators Elisa Serrano Gonzalez, Liabys Alfonso Perez, Rosalba Diaz Quintana, and Roberto Abaen Siglen;

Arborist Rafael Ibanez San Miguel and Manuel Valle Lopez from the Institute of Forestry Research.

Their leadership, participation, expertise, vision, and generosity have been the essential heart of this successful collaboration.

I know I speak for many Americans when I say that we share their pride and joy in having participated day by day in the restoration and preservation of Hemingway's legacy in Cuba.

I count each of them as a valued colleague and as a friend, and I feel honored to have had the privilege, even in a small way, of having worked with them on this historic project.

Initially known as the Hemingway Preservation Foundation, the nonprofit Finca Vigia Foundation has been the critical coordinating agent of U.S. professionals and technical experts who have contributed their expertise, skills, time, and passion to this major preservation undertaking.

Since 2004, the Foundation has harnessed the talents, skill, and collaboration of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Social Science Research Council, Mystic Seaport, and the Northeast Document Conservation Center to create teams of engineers and architects, of preservationists and document conservators, and of botanists, builders, and photographers to:

Architecturally restore and preserve Hemingway's home to its 1950s splendor;

Restore Hemingway's famous yacht, the Pilar;

Conserve and digitize more than 10,000 documents, 4,000 photographs, and 5 rare Hemingway scrapbooks;

Preserve these original documents in Cuba and bring digital images to the United States to the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in Boston;

Design, in a joint U.S.-Cuban collaboration, an onsite archival storage facility with wet and dry conservation laboratories.

There are so many individuals, U.S. companies, and foundations that have made the restoration of Hemingway's house a personal passion. They have dedicated time and talent, materials, and funding to this initiative for over a decade. I would just like to mention a few:

First are the foundations whose early contributions allowed this project and The Finca Vigia Foundation to get its feet on the ground, explore with its Cuban partners how to bring this dream to fruition, and put the first cornerstones in place. They are the Ford Foundation, the J.M. Kaplan Fund, The Christopher Reynolds Foundation, the Stewart Mott Charitable Trust, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Next, I would like to recognize the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which has recognized The Finca Vigia Foundation in Cuba as a U.S. Historic Preservation site—the only such site outside of the United States—and whose experience and technical expertise in preservation and cultural conservation have been invaluable.

I would especially like to note the contributions of Richard Moe, the former President of the National Trust, and Paul Edmondson, the current general counsel with the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Several foundations and U.S. companies have been involved directly in the preservation projects or in providing financial support for this work.

The lead sponsor for document conservation has been the EMC Corporation, headquartered in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, and especially Bill Teuber, Chris Goode, and Joel Schwartz from the company. EMC also reached out to Intel and Emulex, which also provided financial support to the project.

The lead sponsors for the construction of archival storage and conservation laboratories are the Caterpillar Foundation and Caterpillar, Inc., along with the AT&T Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and American Express.

U.S. professionals who have been critical contributors and participants in the technical, document conservation, construction, and architectural teams are William Dupont, the former chief architect with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and currently a professor at the University of Texas, San Antonio; architect planners Leland Cott and Henry Moss with Bruner/Cott & Associates; structural engineer Michael Henry with Watson & Henry Associates; structural engineer Robert Silman with Robert Silman Associates; landscape architects Patricia O'Donnell with Heritage Landscapes; preservation architect Mary DeNadai

with John Milner Architects; and Ronald Staley, a construction specialist from Christman Company in Lansing, Michigan.

Also very much involved are collections conservationist Wendy Claire Jessup and wooden boat curator Dana Hewson with Mystic Seaport.

In the first years of this project, attorney Thomas D. Herman provided invaluable pro bono advice, and attorney Michael Gurdak and his team from Jones Day have provided essential services throughout the project.

Special recognition must also be paid to the tireless work and engagement of Mary-Jo Adams and Robert Vila. Mary-Jo is the executive director of The Finca Vigia Foundation and is its very heart, soul, and beating blood. Without her efforts, this project would not have been possible.

Bob Vila is a builder, a well-known TV host especially of the PBS program "This Old House," and is a recognized building consultant. Bob has been involved on the ground in Cuba with overseeing every phase of the restoration of Hemingway's house and grounds.

Along with Jenny Phillips, he is the co-chair of The Finca Vigia Foundation, but more than anything, we know that, when Bob is on site in Cuba, all is right with the world and, if it isn't, he will make sure that it is.

Finally, I would like to recognize the work of Michael Mershon, who recently left my staff and who worked with me for over a decade on the Hemingway project.

Right now U.S. and Cuban technical teams are constructing a facility on the grounds to carry out on-site archival storage with wet and dry conservation laboratories. Known as the "taller," which means "workshop" in Spanish, this facility will ensure the longevity of the Hemingway papers. It will be the first building constructed in Cuba using U.S. materials and ingenuity since the 1950s.

The Cuban Ministry of Culture views this project as a possible prototype to be replicated across the country in the preservation of cultural heritage. The construction of this critical facility is possible because of the new regulations announced by President Obama in December of 2014.

With very little money and largely during a period of daunting obstacles created by a tense political climate, The Finca Vigia Foundation and its team of experts, in close collaboration with Cuban professionals and experts, have done a great service for the American people, the Cuban people, and, indeed, all of the people of the world.

With passion and professional skill, they recognized that the life, memory, books, papers, and home of Ernest Hemingway are above politics and policies, which are fleeting, while art is eternal. They understand that the legacy of Ernest Hemingway is a shared heritage, belonging to both Cubans and Americans, and in one of the best mod-

els of what can happen when Americans and Cubans collaborate, they have made sure that it will never be lost.

I am so very grateful to Jenny and Frank Phillips for walking into my office 13 years ago and sparking a remarkable and personal journey for me. It has offered me the rare privilege to meet and work with so many extraordinary Cubans and Americans and to participate in preserving our shared heritage around the life and artistic achievements of Ernest Hemingway. I cannot wait to see what the next chapter brings.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE STEVE ISRAEL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable STEVE ISRAEL, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Steve Israel, am submitting my resignation from the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy effective immediately. It has been a privilege and honor to serve in this position and one that I will never forget.

I believe strongly in the importance of robust programming for future and current military leaders facing ever evolving threats and challenges and West Point exceeds this standard with the top-notch education provided to cadets. In my visits to the Academy, I have been profoundly impressed by the leadership, students and staff, who should be commended for their service to our country.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Academy moving forward as a member of the House Appropriations Committee and value my time on the Board of Visitors tremendously.

Sincerely,

STEVE ISRAEL,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical procedure.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1875. An act to support enhanced accountability for United States assistance to Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014; to the Committee

on Foreign Affairs; in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1493. An act to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2908. An act to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1890. An act to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 3, 2016, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5215. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools during FY 2015, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 112 note; Public Law 109-469, Sec. 901(f)(1); (120 Stat. 3537); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5216. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Finalization of Interim Final Rules (Subject to Any Intervening Amendments) Under Consumer Financial Protection Laws (RIN: 3170-AA06) received April 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5217. A letter from the Deputy Director, Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Black Lung Benefits Act: Disclosure of Medical Information and Payment of Benefits (RIN: 1240-AA10) received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5218. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Pay-

ing Benefits received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Federal Traumatic Brain Injury Program report covering FY 2014 and 2015, pursuant to Sec. 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-52) and Sec. 1253 of the act, as amended by the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 300d-53); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5220. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's withdrawal of RG 3.29 — Preheat and Interpass Temperature Control for the Welding of Low-Alloy Steel for Use in Fuel Reprocessing Plants and in Plutonium Processing and Fuel Fabrication Plants [NRC-2014-0070] received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5221. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's withdrawal of RG 3.28 — Welder Qualification for Welding in Areas of Limited Accessibility in Fuel Reprocessing Plants and in Plutonium Processing and Fuel Fabrication Plants [NRC-2014-0069] received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5222. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's revision 4 of RG 1.134 — Medical Assessment of Licensed Operators or Applicants for Operator Licenses at Nuclear Power Plants received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5223. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's withdrawal of RG 1.1 — Net Positive Suction Head for Emergency Core Cooling and Containment Heat Removal System Pumps [NRC-2015-0107] received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5224. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's withdrawal of RG 10.1 — Compilation of Reporting Requirements for Persons Subject to NRC Regulations [NRC-2014-0144] received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5225. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's revision 1 of RG 1.124 — Response Strategies for Potential Aircraft Threats received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5226. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's revision 2 of RG 1.60 — Design Response Spectra for Seismic Design of Nuclear Power Plants received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5227. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's withdrawal of RG 1.37 — Quality Assurance

Requirements for Cleaning of Fluid Systems and Associated Components of Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants [NRC-2014-0158] received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5228. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's revision 3 of RG 1.138 — Laboratory Investigations of Soils and Rocks for Engineering Analysis and Design of Nuclear Power Plants received April 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5229. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from December 13, 2015, to February 10, 2016 on military force against Iraq, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5230. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to Congress on Gifts Given by the United States to Foreign Individuals for Fiscal Year 2015, pursuant to 22 U.S.C.A. 2694; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5231. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the results of an audit of the U.S. House of Representatives' annual financial statements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015; to the Committee on House Administration.

5232. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; Added by Public Law 88-623, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 103-394, Sec. 104(f)); (108 Stat. 4110) and 28 U.S.C. 331; June 25, 1948, ch. 646 (as amended by Public Law 110-177, Sec. 101(b)); (121 Stat. 2534) (H. Doc. No. 114—127); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

5233. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074(a); Added by Public Law 100-702, Sec. 401(a); (102 Stat. 4649) and 28 U.S.C. 331; June 25, 1948, ch. 646 (as amended by Public Law 110-177, Sec. 101(b)); (121 Stat. 2534) (H. Doc. No. 114—128); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

5234. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; Added by Public Law 88-623, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 103-394, Sec. 104(f)); (108 Stat. 4110) and 28 U.S.C. 331; June 25, 1948, ch. 646 (as amended by Public Law 110-177, Sec. 101(b)); (121 Stat. 2534) (H. Doc. No. 114—129); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

5235. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; Added by Public Law 88-623, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 103-394, Sec. 104(f)); (108 Stat. 4110) and 28 U.S.C. 331; June 25, 1948, ch. 646 (as amended by Public Law 110-177, Sec. 101(b)); (121 Stat. 2534) (H. Doc. No. 114—130); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

5236. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, together with the reasons for amendment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(p); Public Law 98-473, Sec. 217(a) (as amended by Public Law 100-690, Sec. 7109); (102 Stat. 4419); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5237. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Lewis-Clark Valley Viticultural Area and Realignment of the Columbia Valley Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2015-0005; T.D. TTB-136; Ref: Notice Nos.: 149 & 149A] (RIN: 1513-AC14) received April 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress entitled, "The Medicare Secondary Payer Commercial Repayment Center in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(h)(8); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1893 (as amended by Public Law 109-432, Sec. 302(a)); (120 Stat. 2992); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 5122. A bill to prohibit further action on the proposed rule regarding testing of Medicare part B prescription drug models; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 5123. A bill to ensure that the United States provides for the families of law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other emergency responders who fall in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 5124. A bill to enforce the Sixth Amendment right to the assistance of effective counsel at all stages of the adversarial process, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide declaratory and injunctive relief against systemic violations of such right, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr.

MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BASS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to discourage corporate inversions and to impose tax on unrepatriated earnings and unrecognized gains in connection with corporate expatriations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5126. A bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 5127. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the exclusivity period for certain drug products developed or labeled so as to reduce drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5128. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to improve the monitoring of mental health and substance abuse treatment programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 5129. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for recreation services on lands managed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, Ms. BASS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5130. A bill to enhance public health and safety by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Federal prison system for incarcerated pregnant women and mothers by establishing a pilot program of critical-stage, developmental nurseries in Federal prisons for children born to inmates, with risk and needs assessments, and risk and recidivism reduction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 5131. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to make improvements to voting system technology, election official training, and protecting voting system source code; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 5132. A bill to adjust the eastern boundary of the Whychus-Deschutes Wilderness Study Area in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities to protect adjacent private property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARDY (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 5133. A bill to improve rural health services, including by requiring the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct an annual study on such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CURELO of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 5134. A bill to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUCK, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina):

H.R. 5135. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide that no regulation issued under section 38(a)(1) of that Act, and no policy or practice in implementing such a regulation, may prohibit the otherwise lawful export for sale or transfer of any firearm silencer, or any component, part, accessory or attachment for any firearm silencer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 5136. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that any legislative or regulatory recommendation of the Federal Trade Commission be accompanied by an economic analysis and include a description of the rationale for such legislation or regulation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 5137. A bill to reform the Moving to Work Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5138. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in

addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 5139. A bill to limit the use of funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2017 to procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from persons that provide material support to certain Iranian persons; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 5140. A bill to repeal certain regulations relating to veterinary feed directive drugs and medically important antimicrobial new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MICA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 5141. A bill to provide for the termination of the Central American Minors Refugee/Parole Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 5142. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the sharing of health information concerning an individual's substance abuse treatment by certain entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 5143. A bill to provide greater transparency and congressional oversight of international insurance standards setting processes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5144. A bill to amend the State Small Business Credit Initiative Act of 2010 to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative and to allow participating States to provide program funds to small businesses for development of affordable housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 5145. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to exclude abuse-deterrent formulations of prescription drugs from the Medicaid additional rebate requirement for new formulations of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5146. A bill to provide for certain actions by the International Trade Administration in order to increase exports by small- and medium-sized enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 5147. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that male and female restrooms in public buildings be equipped with baby changing facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5148. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require publication of information relating to religious exemptions to the requirements of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 5149. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the circumstances under which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide reimbursement for emergency ambulance services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. REED, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 5150. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3031 Veterans Road West in Staten Island, New York, as the "Leonard Montalto Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5151. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an extension of the special survivor indemnity allowance provided to widows and widowers of certain deceased members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. GRJALVA):

H.R. 5152. A bill to amend the hold harmless provision for career and technical education assistance grants to States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5153. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide for the designation of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges by the President, majority of the Supreme Court, Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives, and majority leader and minority leader of the Senate; to the Committee on the

Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 5154. A bill to require that State and local law enforcement agencies conform to Federal guidelines in using cell simulator devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 5155. A bill to establish a grant program to assist dislocated miners in receiving additional training and education to enable them to find and secure new jobs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5156. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide coverage under such Act for credit cards issued to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5157. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a conditional 10 percent rate of tax for certain businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5159. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain recycled water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 5160. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to include as part of the buildings and grounds of the National Gallery of Art any buildings and other areas within the boundaries of any real estate or other property interests acquired by the National Gallery of Art; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 5161. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the qualifications for licensed mental health counselors of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5162. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose to non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers certain medical records of veterans who receive health care from such providers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 5163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for economic recovery in the Virgin Islands and Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Res. 712. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2016 as "Mental Health Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr.

BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUM, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICCILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SABLON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 713. A resolution honoring the vital role of small business and the passion of entrepreneurs in the United States during “National Small Business Week”, beginning on May 1, through May 7, 2016; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 714. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Fair Housing Act and Fair Housing Month, which includes bringing attention to the discrimination faced by minority populations in the United States in housing and housing-related transactions on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, and religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H. Res. 715. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2016 as “National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 716. A resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rising, a seminal moment in Ireland’s journey to independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YODER (for himself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H. Res. 717. A resolution recognizing the importance of cancer research and the contributions of scientists, clinicians, cancer survivors and other patient advocates across the United States who are dedicated to finding a cure for cancer, and supporting the des-

ignation of May 2016 as “National Cancer Research Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

212. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 500, condemning the global unrelenting persecution of Christians and acts of terror and aggression against Christians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

213. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 481, urging Congress to pass bills for the implementation of the Veterans Affairs New Veterans Choice Program; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.R. 5122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 5128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 5129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. This provision permits Congress to make or alter the regulations pertaining to Federal elections.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 5132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 5133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 5135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Commerce Clause

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 5136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 5138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is in the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the administration of the Federal Drug Administration and in the power of the Congress To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States as enumerated by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 5139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 “The Congress shall have the Power . . . provide for the common Defence and General Welfare of the United States.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to make all

Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof."

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3, and 18

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 (the Naturalization Clause), which gives Congress sovereign control over immigration and the vesting of citizenship in aliens. In March 1790, Congress passed the first uniform rule for naturalization under the new Constitution. In *Chirac v Lessee of Chirac* (1817), the Supreme Court affirmed this power rests exclusively with Congress.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 5145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 5150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 5152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 ("Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.")

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—Commerce Clause

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 5160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 5161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 5162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 5163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and excises, to pay Debts and provide for common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. Article IV, Section 3, The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or Property belonging to the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 135: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 167: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 194: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 250: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 297: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 379: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 446: Mr. YARMUTH and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 499: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 563: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 649: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 781: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 814: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 815: Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 845: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 885: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 953: Mr. AGUILAR and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 973: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 980: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1100: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1109: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1112: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1141: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BABIN, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1220: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1312: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1342: Mr. HARDY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 1422: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1616: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1635: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1718: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1779: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1818: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1911: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1943: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1972: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2076: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2090: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. LEE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2103: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2124: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2140: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2141: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2403: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2430: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2533: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2571: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2694: Ms. NORTON and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2713: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2726: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2737: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LANCE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2739: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2748: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2799: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2903: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2939: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2992: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3012: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3069: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 3092: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3119: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3201: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3381: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3406: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3513: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3514: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3523: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3535: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3546: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3632: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3680: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3713: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3742: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3744: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3846: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3862: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3870: Ms. TITUS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3880: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 3892: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 3929: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3957: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3964: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 3989: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 4065: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 4194: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4223: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4229: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 4247: Ms. GRAHAM and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4262: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 4277: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LOEBSSACK.

H.R. 4301: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 4351: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4365: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4378: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4389: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4447: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4450: Mr. HONDA and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4474: Mr. DUFFY and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4480: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4488: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. VELA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4514: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4520: Mr. HILL, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSSACK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4524: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4530: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4539: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4556: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 4564: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4599: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4600: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4615: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 4616: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4625: Mr. GIBSON and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 4640: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. GALLEGGO.

H.R. 4667: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4695: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4715: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 4729: Mr. KILMER and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4730: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 4760: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4764: Ms. NORTON, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4773: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 4775: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 4782: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4795: Mr. BABIN and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 4796: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4798: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4810: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 4819: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 4828: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 4830: Mr. SESSIONS and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4857: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4860: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 4872: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4880: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 4912: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4927: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4932: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4935: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 4938: Mr. NUNES, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4948: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4969: Mr. CHABOT and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4980: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 5011: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 5022: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5025: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 5035: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5044: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRES,

Mr. VELA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 5058: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 5064: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5067: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 5076: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 5090: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. JONES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COOK,

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs.

NAPOLITANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs.

BUSTOS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 5114: Mr. ZINKE.

H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.J. Res. 87: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PITTEGER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. PLASKETT.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. OLSON.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Con. Res. 98: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 14: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SCHRADER.

H. Res. 220: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 221: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H. Res. 343: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HARDY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 600: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Res. 631: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 647: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HILL, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 650: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 686: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 700: Ms. BONAMICI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4651: Ms. DELBENE.